L500
E3s
1954
no3

Hearing of The
ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COSTS
CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE

---oOo---

CALIFORNIA
JUL 13 1962

Held in
Capitol Building
Sacramento, California

---oOo---

November 18, 19, 1954

9:30 O'clock, A. M.

---oOo---

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM ROOM

ALICE BOOK
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
2844 VERNA WAY, SACRAMENTO 21, CALIFORNIA

L500
E35
1954
no.3

Hearing of The
ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COSTS,
CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE

---o0o---

Held in
Capitol Building,
Sacramento,, California

---o0o---

November 18, 19, 1954,

9:30 O'clock A. M.

---o0o---

ALICE BOOK
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
3036 PANAMA AVENUE, CARMICHAEL, CALIFORNIA

APPEARANCES

---o0o---

Assemblyman LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Chairman
Assemblyman Sam Geddes
Assemblyman John L. E. Collier
Assemblyman Frank Belotti
Assemblyman Vernon Kilpatrick
Assemblywoman Dorothy Donahoe

---o0o---

INDEX

WITNESSES:	Page	Line
Dr. Frank Wright	2	3
Robert Nissen	28	10
Dr. Loren Peterson	41	3
Dr. Charles Bursch	65	4
A. H. Glantz	69	1
Herman Jaqueth	83	6
Robert Hanley	109	12
Fred Robinson	117	20
William Koblik	126	9
James Dent	136	14
Dr. Lawson	163	25
Harry McPherson	171	19
Dr. Larry Ram	182	4
Andres F. Oddstad	193	11

---oOo---

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1954, 9:30 O'CLOCK, A. M.

---oOo---

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Ladies and gentlemen, we are ready to begin the hearing. This is the Education Committee Subcommittee on Public School Construction Costs continuing its hearings begun earlier in the year.

I would like to introduce the members of the committee and staff present. On my extreme left is Chairman of the full committee on Education, Assemblyman John L. E. "Bud" Collier of the Eagle Rock-Pasadena District in Los Angeles. Bud, I am mighty glad to have you present with us.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Glad to be here.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Next to me is Assembly Education Committee Secretary, Blance Hanson. My name is LeRoy Lyon, Chairman of the Subcommittee. To my right is Mr. Fred Keating of the Legislative Auditor's office who has been assisting the Committee; and on the far right is Assemblywoman Dorothy Donahoe of the 38th District in Bakersfield. Dorothy, glad you could make it up here. And the court reporter is Miss Alice Book.

We have scheduled Dr. Frank Wright first to give us an outline discussion of a proposal which he has recently put into writing before the annual conference of the California Association of the School Administrators, which would set up a type of equalization aid program for school building financing similar to the equalization program for school operation. Dr. Wright, if you would come before the Committee now, we would be very happy to hear your outline either as it is written or with additional

comments so that we may get a little better idea of what appears to be a different approach than has heretofore been offered.

DR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, this was a paper that I prepared for a section of the annual conference of California Association of School Administrators and which gave me an opportunity --

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Pardon me, Dr. Wright. Let's just wait a second. I see we have two more members of the Committee present, Assemblyman Sam Geddes of the Fifth District of Napa has just arrived. Sam, mighty glad to have you. And Assemblyman Belotti of the First District in Eureka is now present. Dr. Wright, will you proceed.

DR. WRIGHT: The problem of allocating state funds for school buildings - I want to make this statement and refer to certain paragraphs in here instead of repeating - has been a problem which we think has gotten out of the emergency stage maybe. Originally, of course, it was on a grant basis and an emergency basis entirely and the district had to put up, of course, the local bond resources and then we get immediately into a terrific amount of detail and control and one thing and another that seems to have to be there and the law gets more complicated.

Each year somebody cooks up an idea how they might be able to do this and that and it takes three pages to get them back in the reservation again. And then the principal objection that I see to the present plan where the district puts up its available money from the bond money and any other available funds, whatever they have, up to the qualification limit. They put that up and then the State virtually says, "Whatever you are short, we will make up the difference," and then there has been many safeguards and

restrictions placed in the law to say how much that would be.

The latest one is the square foot limitation cost on various types of construction with the variation according to locality, and they cannot exceed that. However, that gives encouragement for districts which - that was supposed to be the top and it becomes something to shoot at as a minimum, so they shoot at it. It is human nature for that sort of thing to happen.

I think it is a good deal like a person might want to buy an automobile and they went down to the bank and said we have five hundred dollars. We want to buy an automobile and so the banker would say, "All right. You go ahead and get your automobile and whatever you are short, we will loan you the money. And if you can't pay it back in a certain length of time, we will give you the rest of it." So I suppose we won't go around looking for Fords. We would probably get our eyes on the Cadillac class, and that seems to be the tendency.

Now, this proposal would transfer the open end from the state to the district and briefly the idea I have given thought to is that the State would allow a certain amount of money per child, per unhoused child, to the district. This amount of money would have to be reduced by the amount of whatever qualifying money would have to be raised. For instance, at the present time we have ninety-five per cent of the five per cent bonding capacity, the district's contribution. That is what they have to obligate themselves to qualify. That is then deducted from the estimated cost of the building, whatever the contract turns out to be. This would make a fixed amount of money which would be on a per pupil basis and then the district would - if they wanted to go beyond that, they could

add any amount they wanted to. Now, the difficulty with the present law is that we require the maximum district contribution from bonds. They have to put up ninety-five per cent of the five per cent and they only have five per cent leeway, and it is not sufficient to give them too much leeway.

The qualifying item probably would have to be a little lower than we now have, or else there would be some leeway for a district to go beyond, but the district having made its effort in bonds - that is about the only way they could do it - then, there virtually would have to be some leeway beyond that to which the district could go.

Then the amount per pupil probably would have to be set at an amount which would provide a minimum acceptable type of school building, but then if they want to go beyond that they would be spending their own money.

At the present time the tendency is for the district to come back to the State for the State to put up the extra, and that is the general idea of it. I don't think it is necessary to read this statement. I might say that beginning at the second paragraph on page 2 and all of page 3 and the first three paragraphs on page 4 contain the discussion about what I have said.

One suggestinn that might be offered as far as the qualifying problem is concerned - for instance, there has been some discussion that the bonds might be changed, I mean the percentage of bonds the district would vote to, say the elementary at six, the highschool at five and the junior college at four, which would be the same average of fifteen per cent. And then require districts to contribute as their qualifying amount five per cent for elementary, four per cent for high school and

three per cent for junior college. That would give them one per cent lee way .

Now, we have used this procedure as far as the amounts or the allocation of funds as a current method that the federal government uses now in taking care of the financially backed areas. They make an allowance of an amount per pupil and that is what they get. They cannot exceed that.

Now, it is true that that allowance is more than probably some of the schools cost. If this sort of program was to be put in operation, it certainly ought to be kept down to the minimum, acceptable minimum, that a district that had no resources to speak of at all could get a good school, but the embellishments or anything that goes beyond that, they themselves would make the determination on that.

As long as the State is on the open end of the deal there will always be trouble. We have seen that in every other financial program whenever administered. This is really a foundation program idea.

You go back into the two hundred twelve for elementary foundation program. The district gets that. It is not enough to run a school, but they only have to put up sixty cents of the ninety cents tax rate. They have that leeway beyond that. At the present time we have it geared up now so a school can be run within the foundation program. It is not a rich one but they can be done, but most districts have some leeway and it was that same thinking or theory that's gone into this discussion that might make it possible to get the State out of being on the open end and put the open end on the district. You will never have a situation where one agency puts up the money and the other spends it, but what you are going to have

conflicts and we think a lot of these matters of approving contracts and plans and all this and that could be very largely eliminated. There certainly have to be limitations on the square footage and on the type of facilities that should be built and all of that.

I am pretty well convinced that districts would probably use a great deal more effort to see how much school building they could get out of the money that was available rather than to have a fixed amount of dollars involved. I will go back to my own experience. When we used to get some money out of federal government or other agencies from time to time, a lump sum of money, and we got that much money based on unhoused children and then we went out to see how much we could build, and if the district has that responsibility, I just can't help but believe in the experience I have had myself and observed myself several years state-wide, that the person that has the responsibility is going to give a lot more care to its expenditure than they might otherwise.

Now, I am not saying the districts have been unduly extravagant, but the controls we have had to impose constantly on them and all the wrangling that goes on over that sort of thing would be brought to a very great minimum and would place the responsibility more on the district than it is at the present time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Dr. Wright, how does the federal government arrive at this per pupil allocation, this federal aid program? You say it is perhaps a little more liberal per pupil than a minimum program would be. How do they arrive at that?

DR. WRIGHT: We furnish them a price schedule in California on what it is estimated it will cost to produce a school building per pupil, and the

federal government has taken that and they operate on a unified principle. There is a difference between elementray, high school and junior college cost per pupil. They have lumped it all together so it becomes a pretty high figure.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Do you know what that figure is?

DR. WRIGHT: It is around about thirteen hundred twenty dollars or twelve sixty.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Does that include any figure for the cost of the site?

DR. WRIGHT: No, it does not. The federal government does not pay for the site. It does not include the site, nor does it include - I am not sure about the furniture.

MR. KEATING: They have some furniture in there.

DR. WRIGHT: They include the furniture, but the principal is a fixed amount. It is true they will take the bids. They have to get the bid approval. They go through a certain amount of that, but if that figure was a little more realistic to fit all the situations of California, it would probably work about as I have discussed it here.

MR. KEATING: May I ask a question? Is the federal figure for the State of California higher than for other states, Dr. Wright?

DR. WRIGHT: I don't know because each state figures out its own. The federal government operates on the basis of each individual state. They are contributing towards the support of education based upon the costs in each state.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And is the federal appropriation based on certain data given to them by the California Department of Education?

It might be that we could make recommendations that would assist us in getting our due proportion of federal funds, then conceivably there would be a little different incentive than if we are in this particular type of program you have outlined for the State.

DR. WRIGHT: You mean for the federal government?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: There might be some incentive for California to try to get the maximum percentage of federal funds by including criteria that might be more than the minimum.

DR. WRIGHT: Well, that could be true.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The same type of human nature.

DR. WRIGHT: Yes, we have taken these costs which have been the average costs that we have determined on a state-wide program both in and out of State aid.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The reason I asked for the federal figures and some of the federal data is to get some idea of how we would approach the figure per pupil that you suggest on page 3 of your statement about the middle of the page in point 6: "Greater economy would result due to fixing full responsibility upon the local board to provide buildings within a fixed amount of funds per pupil, and any expenditures beyond this amount would, of necessity, be a responsibility of the local board." How are we going to arrive at that figure per pupil and then be sure that that is a figure for a minimum good program?

DR. WRIGHT: Oh, I suppose the only way you could do it, you would have to take the current cost of buildings, whether you take the average or - we have a great deal of experience in this state. We have built about a billion dollars worth of school buildings so it would not be difficult to

arrive at a figure based on the cost per pupil of typical good acceptable buildings.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I think if I may interject at this point, we arrive at the very crux of the present problem as it has appeared to me and I would like to refer it to the committee members for further question and discussion, which is the criterion that the office of School Planning now uses, that the State aid program schools should be equivalent to what they call the average of locally financed schools throughout the state, rather than an entirely different criterion which I have been advocating and that is that the State Aid schools be equial to the very best and most economical, not the cheapest, but a very good economical program of the most efficient locally financed district. I have found that that really is quite a different concept than the average of locally financed schools. It may be the difference of three dollars to four dollars a square foot in many areas. So that really in order to find the amount per pupil you would be almost back to taking the per square foot cost of an acceptable building under the present program and multiplying that by fifty-five square feet.

DR. WRIGHT: That is about what it would amount to. I think it would take pretty careful analysis of that per square foot cost. Then, of course, you will find it varies. You see the problem is that each district as long as we follow the theory, and I still can't help but feel it is a good one, the local district should have a very good deal of say in the determining of the type of building and design and that sort of thing they want to get, because they are theoretically going to pay for it one way or another. So when you get into that sort of thing and you pick up all of the resources of a

district, the only place they have got to go to do anything is through the State Aid Program. This kind of deal would make it possible to hit at a much lower figure maybe theoretically than this average deal we are talking about, which would be that acceptable good substantial construction of a good utilization value, whatever that might be. Now, if they want to tile walls clear to the ceiling or something of that sort, if they ever do that sort of thing, or whatever they want to add to it, the same as they do in the foundation program, the local district makes that determination. But, the foundation program idea would have to be an acceptable building and we certainly would never concede that we ought to go down to an austerity level bottom program. You haven't stated that either. It should be good substantial construction that will give the education utilization satisfaction we should have for schools.

Now, there are a lot of things that you can do, things in different ways. Now, there would be - it would be a matter of just determining what that cost should be to provide that kind of facility per pupil. I think it can be done, but unless you leave some leeway for the district, then you have got to set it up high enoughthat you meet all the contingencies that you run into throughout the State. That is why we have the per square foot cost.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I think you have already indicated that you feel this type of program might well reduce the amount of friction between the Office of School Planning and the local school boards and perhaps would eliminate many mandatory requirements that the field representatives are making under the State aid program because they feel compelled under the law to do so.

DR. WRIGHT: Well, certainly it would, because if the responsibility of the burden is now on the State, on the open end and if it wasn't for the Department of Education exercising the pressure they do on some of these districts, you would find these costs clear out of line. That is where a great many of our nasty arguments are, because somebody on the local level wants to go beyond on things we can't justify on a State Aid program. We never had this trouble we are experiencing now until we got into State Aid because we are more in an advisory capacity to help districts design a good building, but we weren't concerned in the costs of it because they paid the bill.

Now, it is different. The State Department of Education has a very definite responsibility and much of the trouble has come out of that, trying to render that service to the people of California to keep some person from going clear out on a limb. For instance, we had to come up with this very obnoxious list of things that were unjustified. Now, those problems were never in a locally financed area thing. If they wanted to put a decoration around a flag pole, that was up to them. They had to account to their own taxpayers. We are interested enough to protect the finances of the State to bear down on them, and, of course, nobody wants to have that thing happen. We say on the one hand that this is a local problem, local board has control, you hire your own architects, then we turn around and up to a point it is and it isn't. So right away you get into that conflict.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Another question. It is your opinion that we would still have to finance this equalization program that you outline from the State bond issues, is it not?

DR. WRIGHT: There is no question about it. The magnitude of the building program being what it is you can't possibly get it out of current resources. As far as the State putting up the money, I don't think there would be any difference. It is simply a different approach of how you put the money out. There is a lot of detail that is not contained in this that would have to be worked out.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I would like to ask the other members of the committee if they have some specific questions on this program that Dr. Wright has outlined.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: Not a question, but I think Dr. Wright has brought out a very important point here, this allocation of money to districts. In reviewing this the other day I noticed the different districts were allowed a larger allocation, and it has been the policy of the board there to use up all those funds, to use up to the limit and maybe a little more of the State funds, and I have been thinking along the same lines and I am glad to see you worked out the details so well, because I think that we can put it on that basis, that we allocate so much per child and make it uniform. If they do have to come back for other funds there would have to be some good reason. In other words, we will cut the cloth to fit the person. The way we are doing now is really to my way of thinking very poor business, in saying you have so much money and now see what you can do with it. And they utilize it up pretty well, I have observed in going around the state, and it seems you have hit the nail on the head with this suggestion.

DR. WRIGHT: It is just human nature and you can't get away from it as long as somebody else is putting up the money.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Or it appears they are putting it up.

DR. WRIGHT: Appears. They are not actually. The parent has the same problem when he gives the kid an allowance and says, "Now you are to buy your clothes and everything out of that." The kid takes better care of his socks if he has to buy it out of his own allowance, yet the parent is still paying for it actually. It is not any criticism of anybody. It is the way things work.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Any further questions. Mr. Keating has a question, I believe.

MR. KEATING: Dr. Wright, I haven't had a chance to read this report very closely, but how would you compute the unhoused child that you are talking about?

DR. WRIGHT: The same as we do now.

MR. KEATING: On a projection?

DR. WRIGHT: Yes, you can't do it any other way. You have got to project because it takes a year and a half or two years to build a school and you have got to project. I didn't develop the details on that part of the process in this report. I was concentrating on the way we distribute the money and the basis on which we do it and placing the responsibility on the other end, rather than on the State.

MR. KEATING: Do I understand the State subsidy you are talking about here would be used with local funds or independent of local funds?

DR. WRIGHT: No, it would be used with local funds.

MR. KEATING: The ability of local funds with the State subsidy to do what they want?

DR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. KEATING: Would that encourage the expenditure of local funds before they ask for State funds, or what safeguards would we use there?

DR. WRIGHT: We would have the same problem we have now. When you figure out your fifty-five feet and they have gone ahead and built a swimming pool, it counts. That is not so much of a problem. You would still have all of that to do. We wouldn't get rid of everything.

MR. KEATING: And the determination of local funds, the use of local funds towards their building program would still be determined by a state agency?

DR. WRIGHT: Well, I think as far as I had gone on it, the limitation of fifty-five feet would have to occur there.

MR. KEATING: I am thinking about the dollars and cents that could be used for other than school buildings.

DR. WRIGHT: Oh, I suppose you would find somebody that would turn around and take this money and build a garage out of it, but if they did, they would have to account for it to the local people as to why they parked the kinds out in the gutter. It's never been done before to my knowledge particularly, but I suspect that might happen, but I don't believe those risks would be any greater than the risks we are taking now, and I don't think the school people are stupid enough to go and do a thing like that. It might happen in some semi-isolated area or something like that, but it wouldn't happen any worse than it has.

MR. KEATING: Then, in order to justify for a state subsidy as you speak about here, they would have to be in the same financial conditions they are right now?

DR. WRIGHT: Yes, except that they might not be expected to put up

as much money to qualify, but by the same token, the amount that would be allowed would be at a lower minimum than maybe the square footage now, so they would have some leeway to go beyond to take care of the extra things they want to take care of themselves.

MR. KEATING: You want to give more local money - the bond?

DR. WRIGHT: The bond money can only be used for school buildings and equipment. They would have to make up their minds whether they want to put it in a school building or elaborate equipment. They have to make their own choice.

MR. KEATING: Then the use of the bond money is pretty open?

DR. WRIGHT: Well, you get ahold of the district attorney and the state attorney, they can buy equipment and all that sort of thing, but in spite of that, you see, a district would only have so much money. They would have to make the decision of what they are going to do with it, and I just can't conceive of a person, board or administrator, spending money for a lot of elaborate this and that and then not provide enough space to house the kids. They would at least have to provide class rooms. You have to have those limitations. You would never get away from all the requirements of the law.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Getting back to the present law and just for the purposes of this question, assuming that your proposal might not become law in the next year and we still have the same program, the same type of program, do you think that it would be possible to substantially reduce the present figures that the local allocations board is working with, per square foot figures for class room , multipurpose rooms, administrative unit - the eighteen or twenty categories now set forth by the administrative

regulations? Those figures which you have indicated have in many instances instead of being a ceiling, have become a floor. Do you think we could substantially reduce some of those to effect a little greater pressure on the districts to come in with a minimum basic program instead of a more than minimum basic program?

DR. WRIGHT: Well, it is pretty hard for me to answer that question.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And it is a fairly technical one based on local data of construction cost, availability of materials, labor costs, and so on, but we have had some pretty good indications in the figures that are coming in, in the same cost group area within ten miles of each other. We have had state aid projects coming in all the way from nine dollars twenty cents to thirteen dollars. That's been the gap, the spread, indicating to me anyway from those figures that possibly the thirteen dollars and fifty cent ceiling per square foot on class rooms is too high by a substantial percentage.

DR. WRIGHT: Well, there are a lot of factors that come into this proglem. I have known contractors to bid when they have got plenty of work and they are not very anxious to bid, and also if you can find them when they are hungry you can get a much better bid. So no one can predict what that is going to be and the price set has to be based on past experience - if labor becomes more plentiful and they don't have to use so much overtime and material changes and prices change, and there are many many factors, and it will vary in accordance with the time of year. And those are the factors that come into it.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: However, in the two instances I mentioned, they were in the same immediate areas, the same time of the year, the

same economic conditions, the same season, so none of the variables that you have just mentioned would apply in comparing those two cases where one State Aid project came in at nine twenty and the other at thirteen fifty.

DR. WRIGHT: There are two variables, the local school board and their employees. Those are the variables.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And the contractor?

DR. WRIGHT: Yes. Those are the variables. If we are going to maintain some local autonomy, you have got that problem to contend with. If you are going to go into state constructinn, then you have got some other things, and my observation has been, before you get into that, you want to take a look at the square foot cost of the State as compared to the school. The school construction is not very expensive. I think the districts generally, and I know our Department has - everybody who has worked with this thing all have done their level best to screen out all the unnecessary things and gadgets and whatnot, but I think there has been a fair job done in that, and I think the only way we can do it is to keep the pressure on.

There have been some situations where there have been some people that have shot for that ceiling, and there have been some of those people been pretty well worked over for doing that, and I think we are going to see less of that going on than we have in the past, because if we don't we are liable to do just what you are talking about, get down to the place you can't even build a school building in some circumstances. I think that ceiling ought to be a safeguard, but not one they can reach up to and figure they are going to hang on to every time they come around.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I haven't had a chance here to study this program as carefully as I would like to, but in your plan here, Dr. Wright, how about the repayment of these loans? Do you contemplate amything so far as repaymen to the State is concerned?

DR. WRIGHT: I don't know why we should.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Well, another thought came to my mind here. With the Board of Equalization coming in with their formal report as to the assessment practices throughout the State of California, in your opinion, do you think that with that report coming in and Chapter 1466 becoming law, that we will be confronted with this acute problem of building today as we are? In other words, more than likely a lot of school districts throughout the State will be in a position to go ahead and bond - those that have reached their bonding capacity will automatically as a result of 1466 be in the area where they can levy more bonds by increasing their assessment practices.

DR. WRIGHT: Some of them will. It depends on what their impact is. If they have this continuing influx of children as they have been having, and as it appears some of them will continue to have, they will still have to come to the outside. But, as fast as assessments go up, of course, the more capacity they will hav e and they will have to put up more money. It will certainly equalize the burden between counties statewide, that is, out of the state fund. Some of them under the five per cent bonding capacity get by with a less amount of money as compared to another. You are geared to a percentage of assessed valuation. The assessed valuation is the key to the whole business, both the qualifying and repayment. You can equalize that if a district goes on up, the county goes up - then,

of course, they will have to put up more money.

Now, as to what districts or how many districts would be capable of taking care of their own problems, I don't know, because I don't know what that will be, but undoubtedly it will provide a great deal more money from local resources.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Your approach on a per pupil basis, wouldn't that kind of open up the field to re-examining the present distribution of money to school districts so far as your allocation of equalization moneys are concerned?

DR. WRIGHT: Well, that goes to districts on a per pupil basis base.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: For instance, say that we have fifty pupils in a district and that is an impoverished school district. How would your plan here work for that school district, for that fifty pupils, if you are going to put it on a per pupil basis?

DR. WRIGHT: Well, they would have to determine the number of square feet of usable space that they had and multiply the total enrollment or ADA, if the law calls for ADA. You would want to be careful you didn't get beyond the area where the small school formula applies.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I was thinking of the small school district.

DR. WRIGHT: That would be one - there would have to be a different ratio of money per pupil for the small schools to take care of the increased cost of providing services for small schools. It would have to be on the same kind of sliding scales for the number of square feet allowed per pupil in schools under three hundred, I believe.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Well, now, in your plan here, have you

taken that into consideration?

DR. WRIGHT: I haven't worked out any plan.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: This is just a suggestion here which you are tossing out to be kicked around between now and general session of the Legislature?

DR. WRIGHT: The principal thinking back of this is to place the responsibility, the open end, from the state back on to the districts and to get the money to them in some formwhereby they make all these decisions in place of making decisions and then coming back asking the state to confirm the decisions, bad or good, as they might be. There is a lot of work that would have to go into this sort of thing before the law was amended.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I think you have a good idea. I would like to talk to you more. I don't think we can overnight arrive at a solution of this problem, complex as it is.

DR. WRIGHT: I was called upon to discuss school financing and in thinking of what I was going to say I came up with this idea, which I have been thinking about for a long while, and I sent a copy to Assemblyman Lyon and Senator Dilsworth, and that is how I happen to be here today. We are in the notion, I think, of trying to draft some skeleton legislation. I don't know whether the Legislature wants to buy it or not. You never get anywhere unless you try.

ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI: I was going to say I like your thinking on putting more of the responsibility back on to the local districts.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: That is where it belongs.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And that is where it traditionally has been.

DR. WRIGHT: I think we would eliminate much of the friction that goes on.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And in the long run effect as economical, if not more economical, program. I think that is the key.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: It eliminates the so-called passing the buck.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Dr. Wright, I have a couple of questions not directly related to what you have said, but because of your position as Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction you might be able to comment upon them. I am informed that at the moment the State has loaned about six million dollars less than the statutory maximum possible to the impoverished school districts under the State aid loan program which limits loans to five million dollars a month. Knowing that the state is still growing at the rate it has been for four years, that is between one thousand and eleven hundred residents, which means four hundred school students - that seems a little high, but anyway, that being true, how do you account for the fact that apparently the demand upon the program has been less even than the statutory maximum?

DR. WRIGHT: Oh, there are a lot of factors in that. It takes a school district sometime to get around to decide what they want to do. They have to convince themselves that they want to apply for a loan. There are many areas that are reluctant to get into state relationship. They have heard a lot of stories and maybe rightfully so that if they get tangled up with the state they have a lot of red tape and paper work to do, which is probably true, so they fiddle around with that and they don't get it done properly and some of the districts do not have the staff to follow it up, and the architects

attempt to do it in many instances, and they get bogged down and there is a lot of delay. And then they have to vote the bonds. They have to have a campaign to agree to accept the loan.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Do you think more bond issues have been failing in the last six or eight months than before?

DR. WRIGHT: Well, there was a period where some failed. I don't think there was any pattern established. I don't think it can be said they failed because of any particular reason. I think most of them are local problems. They were not properly presented, issues arise, and one thing and another happens. Something happens. Bond issues in many areas where they thought everything was clear and everything was going to go through have failed. All of a sudden something slips across the thing and kills the whole business, because your margin of putting a bond across is very small. A certain percentage of people are going to oppose all bonds and you have to have a two thirds vote. So all those factors enter into it and then there are some delays.

I think there's been more delay been charged against the official agencies of the state, educational and finance, and rightfully charged against them. Districts will file stuff and then they they do not follow it up. They assume everything is all right and pretty soon they find out in six weeks nothing has happened and they get excited about it and blame somebody for holding it up. In many instances there have been misunderstandings and the normal sort of thing that happens when you have a government agency having to work together with them and at long distances, you see. Sacramento and Los Angeles are the two headquarters agencies and by the time they get in there and our staff is not large enough to give

prompt service to everybody, and when you get a big high school problem, for instance, on a planning problem involving four or five million dollars, you can't brush that off in a couple of days. It takes time to do it. So those things pile up.

Right now we are confronted with an almost intolerable task of reapproving an amended application under Public Law 515 where California got some twenty or twenty-twomillion dollars out of the fifty-five million dollar allocation of federal money, and that all goes through our department. We are bogged down now. One of the men went home yesterday with complete jitters. He is off now and so that puts the pressure on the rest. So you can't do everything at one time. So it is just a combination of all of those things that make up the delay, and I don't think you can place the responsibility on any one particular place.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I wasn't thinking of any such thing.

DR. WRIGHT: I have heard men say it takes two years. I have known other districts that got those things settled up in six to nine months, and it can be done.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thanks very much. I would like to correct the record. I said there was a certain figure less than actually legally possible. Up to October 31 of this year, it would have been possible to have used one hundred thirty million dollars of Chapter 19, whereas only one hundred six million, three hundred four thousand had been used. It was a difference of about twenty-four million dollars. In other words, we have used twenty-four million less than we legally could have, which really surprised me when I got the figure, knowing what the urgent press is in many many areas of the state.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Mr. Chairman,I think one of the reasons is what Dr. Wright says. For I have got a county grammer school that has been arguing for a year whether or not to borrow and finally about sixty days ago they decided to ask the State for money. It's been going on for a year and their problem is acute between the aged decrepit buildings and the results of earthquakes, but it's taken them a year to decide to finally borrow, and there are other areas where I know money has been sought and the long delay is that in some of these small schools particularly and the rural schools, they don't have the kind of staffs that know how to follow through on the intricate details and they send the first form in and sit there and wait for someone to hand them the four million dollars, and they don't have the proper liaiason facilities in the local level. A lot of them are reluctant to have to borrow and then when they start, their machinery is a year behind this loan business . Actually this school should be charged against some of that twenty-four million dollars.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It may be increasing reluctance on the part of the districts to get into the program is on account of that. If they can finance locally that might be a good thing, but if kids are remaining on double session and being jeopardized, then, of course, it is not a good sign.

DR. WRIGHT: I don't think the five million dollars is anything too realistic.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Apparently it was more than adequate rather than less.

DR. WRIGHT: I don't think they bumped up against anything par-

ticularly. It was to stop some districts from coming in and grabbing the whole works, and that was the purpose of it, and I don't think it has been a particular problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: One more detailed question. That has been implicit in much of the testimony we have received in the past and many of the communications that I have received, and that is counting foundation laid so that the district could adequately anticipate its future needs over a twenty-four months' period. Before that requirement was written into the law about two years ago, I believe, districts were given considerably more latitude in estimating their future needs. It appeared though that the law may have been written and amended to be too strict, that there might well be another amendment to permit them to go beyond foundations laid to include tract maps recorded and approved which would show at least a substantial probability of being executed within a year's time.

It is easy enough to tell on a local level which tract maps which have been approved are about to move and which are perhaps on the dead file so to speak. Do you think we would get into any real difficulty if the law were amended back to allow districts to project their twenty-four months' needs including approved and recorded tract maps as well as in addition to foundations laid?

DR. WRIGHT: Well, I think, Mr. Lyon, we would, for the reason that before we took subdividers' statements and all this and that, and again you have got to keep in mind that those things may be a little easier to get when somebody else is putting up the money. So we went into this other arrangement. I think the substitute for going back to that might

be what was done for the high schools, to allow them to project the estimated ADA for three years in place of two years, but keep the house county down to something you can actually see.

Right now you can't tell. Now, I understand maybe a year ago you could get financing for a thousand or two thousand houses all at once. Finance companies are not financing at that rate now. They have to finance in smaller blocks and then sell them, so a map might show something that would never exist.

Throughout the State you have all kinds of planning commissions, county planning commissions, city planning commissions - very hard to make anything definite. The house count, either the foundation is started or isn't, and projecting the enrollment by what kids are going to be in school and so forth, that is fairly accurate, and at least it is something that is tangible.

But, I don't believe that the subdivision business is a very accurate one. In fact, I know it isn't from what we had before.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It is very interesting to get your comments in the record.

DR. WRIGHT: I don't want to have anything more to do with that. We can count houses. We can't count anticipated houses.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: You are right there - the projected subdivisions which never materialize. And I can show you districts where they are going to put three thousand homes. If they are lucky they may get a thousand.

DR. WRIGHT: That is what brought about this change.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Dr. Wright, this foundation program

keeps running through my mind here. Where would be the critical breaking point on the dollars assessed value behind pupils, those that would get foundation money and those that would not?

DR. WRIGHT: There wouldn't be any because it is just as it is now.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: In other words, every school district in the State of California regardless of eligibility would be eligible for State aid.

DR. WRIGHT: If they need the state money after having voted this capacity in bonds. Take the city of Los Angeles. They have the same bonding as does the poorest elementary district, but Los Angeles by voting five per cent has got enough money to take care of its needs.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: You have to meet your bonding capacity?

DR. WRIGHT: You would have to qualify and it is not inconceivable to say that Los Angeles some of these days is going to come in under State aid because what we are talking about - yesterday Mr. Lyon was telling me his hom town is coming in under state aid. Whittier High School for years was one of the most wealthy areas of the State of California. Here they are on state aid, East Whittier. Property was extremely valuable. It is still valuable, but look at the kids they have got. So you can't tell where, and I wouldn't be surprised if we are not going to see a good share of the districts coming in. I don't know what percentage of them. Nobody can tell, but they would all have to meet the same qualification requirements locally, having made the same effort.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thanks very much Dr. Wright. I think you have made a very valuable contribution. I would like to call on Mr. Bob Hanley, who will introduce the school board member who has some

problems he would like to bring before the committee and also to make himself available for any committee questions. Mr. Hanley, would you come forward.

MR. HANLEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Robert E. Hanley, Legislative Representative, California Farm Bureau Federation. I would like to present Mr. Ralph Nissen, a member of the School Board at Williams, for a statement.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Nissen, would you please make yourself comfortable and we will get the proper spelling of your name.

MR. NISSEN: N-i-s-s-e-n.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Nissen, what school board district, what school district do you represent as a member of the board?

MR. NISSEN: Williams Unified.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Williams Unified Elementary?

MR. NISSEN: No, it is a Unified and High School District. That is in Colusa County.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Near what larger town?

MR. NISSEN: Well, it is half way between Woodland and Willows.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I see. That helps to locate it for me. Well, I will ask a couple of questions first. For the record and the members of the committee in southern California I have been receiving a number of complaints and comments from individual school board members and school administrators concerning the activities and the operation of the field office of the Office of School Planning, and, as is well known, plans of all school districts except city school districts and charter city school districts must go to the Office of School Planning for checking

and approval. It was my thought that we get some comment if we could of the situation in Northern California.

Now, Mr. Nissen, have you as a member of the Board in your Unified District had any particular problem? Have you been growing rapidly, adding new schools in your district, or new class rooms?

MR. NISSEN: Comparable with Southern California, of course we are in a completely different situation. Our school district has doubled in enrollment in about eight years, but that still is a matter of four hundred students for our unified district.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Your present enrollment is four hundred from kindergarten through high school?

MR. NISSEN: Yes. And we were just unified about a year and a half ago. We had separate elementary and high schooldistricts, and we faced a situation of having an antequated school plant that by the grace of the fire commissioner we are still allowed to operate. It is a building forty-three or forty-four years old and it was designed for about half the students that we now have. We have had quite a little problem.

We have had no bonded indebtedness on the high school district so we were in a position where on a per pupil basis we weren't in too bad shape. We could raise a fairly good sum of money, we felt.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You are entirely locally financed? You are not on the state aid program?

MR. NISSEN: However, to build a new plant we would probably have to get state aid.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Your local assessed valuation would not permit the building of a new unit, then?

MR. NISSEN: We have had a very peculiar situation. We have had two state aid elections turned down. They approved the bond issue to the maximum capacity and then turned us down on the state aid.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I see. Now, have you had any new building program then at all in the last several years?

MR. NISSEN: Well, it was delayed until we had a unification program put through so that whatever was done in the way of financing new building would be under the unification program, so that the school district would be the people that would be paying for the school facilities. The result is that we are now faced with building this new plant and we bumped into a lot of problems both working on and planning out this new building.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is exactly what I am interested in hearing about. Would you just outline from the beginning then the nature of the difficult as you have found it in trying to arrive at a school plan and drawings for your new plant?

MR. NISSEN: Well, I think one primary thing - I don't know who it was here brought out the problem of the small district not having somebody really capable of handling the situation. We are sitting there as a school board. We hire as nearly capable administrator as we can. We are not experienced in the building program, and the result is who are we going to for advice. On a lot of these things we come down and we bumped into the school house planning. They have certain restrictions. Some of them we think are foolish, probably because we think the cost is excessive.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Would you detail those. That is the very type of thing we are interested in finding out.

MR. NISSEN: Well, that would be pretty hard to answer just offhand.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What type of requirement would they insist upon that you feel is increasing the cost of your plant, a requirement that would not be a legal requirement as far as the Field Act or the Health and Safety Code is concerned?

MR. NISSEN: Well, we would question some of their restrictions on us as far as the type of building that we should erect.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: As to type - you mean frame versus concrete or brick, or you mean the number of windows or the number of square footage of windows, or the type of lighting system? We have got to have it specifically. I don't understand yet what you mean. You say the type of building.

MR. NISSEN: We feel we want an adequate building. When we have a building, something that is suitable for the district, and yet we don't feel that it should be anything that is gaudy or better than what most of the people in the community would have for homes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate that. Have they suggested that you needed more cabinet work or more cupboards or more acoustical tile or more other types of tile than you thought was necessary for that particular district? I would like to have it detailed.

MR. NISSEN: Well, I wouldn't entirely blame them on the thing. We naturally have a firm of architects, a reputable firm, I believe, working on the plan, and we work with them on these plans, and we as board members will question some, possibly some cabinet work or something like that, and immediately the reply we get back from them is that that is something the School House Planning is going to require us to have.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: They say the School Planning is going to

require you to have?

MR. NISSEN: That it will be necessary to get their approval.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: But, you haven't come around to the point that the School Planning has said you will have to have that - you haven't actually got to the stage where you have talked with the man from the School Planning yet?

MR. NISSEN: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You just get it second hand from the architect you have, that you have got to have this or that because School Planning is going to require it?

MR. NISSEN: Yes. We are further faced with the situation that we sort of question, and that is we are using a set of plans that are a general plan that is very similar to a number of other schools, and we sort of question why we should be required to pay a full eight per cent architectural fee when very definitely they probably have been able to adapt their plans from some other school that they have built in our area where it would be the same type building and all, too.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, hasn't some representative of the Office of School Planning been out to consult with you and the board in the preliminary stages of working up your new school plant and working up your plans?

MR. NISSEN: Well, we had them, yes, working - we had an application in before the allocation board. That is a preliminary application, and they were there working with us on that, but, of course, that didn't get down into too much detail because all we had there was just a footage.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Yes, a question of house count and unhoused

pupil count and priority points and that sort of thing?

MR. NISSEN: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Any questions that occur to other members of the committee? I still haven't been able to get a full picture. It looks to me, first of all, you haven't really personally as the board bumped into any specific conduct on the part of any member of the Office of School Planning that has caused you trouble?

MR. NISSEN: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You just got the round about information through the architect?

MR. NISSEN: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Did I understand you to say, Mr. Nissen, you have used duplicate plans that were used by other districts and you have used duplicate plans that were used by other districts, and you have had to pay your eight per cent for those duplicate plans?

MR. NISSEN: The plans we are using, this same architectural firm has a number of other schools in this area and the plans - I wouldn't say they are absolutely identical, but they certainly are very very similar.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: I was just going to ask if the architects that you have are firms that have done other construction work with the State a good deal?

MR. NISSEN: They do a lot of school house work.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: They do?

MR. NISSEN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: It would be reasonable to suppose

when they say this or that specific thing was necessary that they assuredly have the information that it really is?

MR. NISSEN: I would imagine yes. They have a number of schools in our immediate area.

ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI: Would you say that a lot of the responsibility for the cost of building the school could be directly attributed to the members say of the board of trustees there where they feel that because their school - it is their own school and their own district and they want to take pride in it, and they are willing, for instance, instead of cutting down, they want to use some special type of construction, maybe brick, and for some of the pillars, instead of using steel like they have in some areas,they prefer to use some ornamental type of construction that raises the cost. You would think that perhaps it could be eliminated if the local people would be willing to make certain sacrifices in that regard? Don't you think that they are to blame to a large extent?

MR. NISSEN: Oh, I think that is true. However, in our own particular case at the present time we are trying to work it out so we can build what we can with what money we have available, and in our particular case, certainly we have completely forgotten any ideas of anything that is fancy at all. We are going ahead and build what we can with what money we have available, and certainly there is no gingerbread with what we are working with today.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Nissen, would you say then that you have had something of a difficult time in arriving at an economical school plant - as economical as your district would desire because of some reluctance on the part of the architect to draw for you what you have

requested and that that reluctance may have been based on what he said the Office of School Planning was going to require in the way of cabinets or lighting or heating?

MR. NISSEN: Well, let's see. I think he probably has attempted to draw what we wanted but, the problem, I think the problem there is this, that we as school board members feel that when you don't know whether you are being led around by the architect or school house planning or even your own superintendent as far as whether your thinking is being influenced as to what you should have - we sort of feel we are in a helpless position of where we should have somebody we could turn to whether it should be the state or somebody that we should be able to turn to for good sound conservative advice and we don't feel we are getting that now.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I see.

ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI: I would like to see the law changed whereby your own local board would have the entire responsibility and then to do whatever they think is necessary for their local district, and then if you need some help why go to the State and have someone to go to help, but not until you requested it. Would you like to see it that way?

MR. NISSEN: I can see a lot of problems with that, too. That would be fine until you would wake up and find that you hadn't met some requirements in some fine print somewhere for getting this state aid somewhere along the line. What I meant was in line with some particular type of building construction that we might have done.

ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI: If you could come to Sacramento to the Division of Architecture and get a set of plans that you have in mind that you think would fit in pretty well with your whole requirements, do you think

you could find a contractor that you could go to that would follow those plans without any changes and you wouldn't need the services of an architect?

MR. NISSEN: Well, I think it would probably be necessary to have an architect possibly do some adapting of those maybe peculiar local conditions. I don't see why you can't have a general set of plans or at least two or three possible optional ones that could be used, one of which could be used.

ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI: That is what everybody said they don't see why they can't be had, but we haven't been able yet to find where the contractors are willing to cooperate, for instance, with the architect, those that are responsible for the planning of these buildings so that when changes are necessary, then the cost will not be increased to the extent that it will be even more expensive than to have an originalset of plans drawn.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Keating, did you have a question you wanted to ask of Mr. Nissen?

MR. KEATING: Mr. Nissen, how much bond money did the people vote for the district bonds?

MR. NISSEN: We voted our capacity in our district. It is three hundred fifty thousand dollars.

MR. KEATING: For a high school level?

MR. NISSEN: Yes, sir.

MR. KEATING: And how many children do you have in the high school there?

MR. NISSEN: Well, projected, we have about one hundred thirty, I

think it is now and we will have in two year over two hundred.

MR. KEATING: So your board is trying to go to two hundred from one hundred thirty and you have got three hundred fifty thousand dollars and you can't build a high school. How many classes were you trying to put up?

MR. NISSEN: We are trying to build it where it will take care of the upper six grades and be a combined high and junior high.

MR. KEATING: And that will contain how many pupils? Have you got an estimate on that? I suppose it would be closer to two hundred right now?

MR. NISSEN: It would be over two hundred.

MR. KEATING: You have your site?

MR. NISSEN: We are in the process of acquiring it right now.

MR. KEATING: Out of this three hundred fifty thousand dollars?

MR. NISSEN: Now, we have at the end of this year we have about one hundred twenty thousand dollars of our money in addition to the three hundred fifty.

MR. KEATING: So you will have one hundred twenty plus three hundred fifty thousand dollars?

MR. NISSEN: In our own building fund.

MR. KEATING: Almost a half a million dollars for a high school plant.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And Junior High.

MR. NISSEN: It would be a combined high and junior high.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: How much more did you figure you would need from the state aid to finish that?

MR. NISSEN: At the time we were working on the state aid they were talking about, all the estimates we had were in the neighborhood of six hundred thousand dollars.

MR. KEATING: Did you ask your architect when you hired him if he could develop plans to bring you in within a five hundred thousand dollar bid figure for the construction of this high school or did you just give him a--

MR. NISSEN: Well, at the time that we were applying for state aid on it the architect was drawing plans on approximately a six hundred thousand dollar plant and we are not getting - we are not working on about five hundred thousand dollar plan, for about five hundred thousand dollar plant. Of course, there are a lot of things that have been curtailed. We won't have a cafeteria and a band room, several things like that, that we would have had in the other plant.

MR. KEATING: He thinks he can't bring you in a set of plans for five hundred thousand dollars?

MR. NISSEN: We feel we can now. Here we are apparently able to build with our own money.

MR. KEATING: Can you ask him to bring it in within a certain figure or did you give him a free hand?

MR. NISSEN: No, we told him he had to get it under that.

MR. KEATING: I see.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I was about to make the concluding observation Mr. Nissen hadn't yet run into the difficulty we had thought he had run into, so actually we haven't got for the record the testimony which we really had thought we were going to get, although you have made some interesting

contributions. We appreciate that.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Do you know how many architects are available up in your area of the county that would be interested in bidding on such a job as this that you have up there in the construction of a school?

MR. NISSEN: There are none in our immediate area. We have a firm of Sacramento architects. However, at the time that we unified why there were a number of architects-there was a firm or two from Chico and one from Redding and another one from Sacramento that were around to see us at the time about - said they understood we had a building program and they would like to be considered.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Did you consider all the architects who were interested in your building project up there?

MR. NISSEN: No, the firm we have contracted with happened to be pretty well known to several of the board members and that was the main reason we had for hiring them. All we have is a standard contract form under state law that - we can't bid with them. We have no opportunity to do that.

MR. KEATING: May I ask what that standard contract form is under state law?

MR. NISSEN: What does it provide for, you mean?

MR. KEATING: Yes.

MR. NISSEN: That eight per cent fee.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It is not a standard contract.

MR. KEATING: It is not a state law. That is an established contract form but it has nothing to do with the law, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And it is just a recommended form that's

been published and put out. Sometimes the impression is given it is required. The eight per cent just happens to be an average. It is a standard custom but there are many other types of contract that can be executed.

MR. NISSEN: For school construction?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Some of it is. Apparently there is a widespread impression that what you received was a legal standard form.

MR. NISSEN: Well, it was certainly the impression.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Mr. Chairman, he has ansered the question I was going to ask him next, if that eight per cent acted as a deterrent so far as contacting other architects was concerned, and undoubtedly it has done that very thing. He was under the impression it was a state law that eight per cent fee shall be paid.

MR. NISSEN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thank you sir.

MR. NISSEN: The board was definitely under that impression.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: To your knowledge, did anyone from the Office of School Planning make any recommendations directly or indirectly as to architects that might be contacted?

MR. NISSEN: No, sir, I was president of the board at the time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thanks very much, Mr. Nissen. We appreciate your taking the time and trouble to come all the way down here to discuss your problem with us.

MR. NISSEN: I am sorry I wasn't entirely able to do what you wished.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is perfectly all right. Dr. Loren Peterson of the Stockton School District is here. We would like to have you

come to the witness chair. Dr. Peterson, would you just have a seat and make yourself comfortable.

DR. PETERSON: We are not available at this time for state aid. We have been financing our own building program.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I would like to say for the record then at this point that Dr. Loren D. Peterson, who is the Assistant Business Manager of the Stockton Unified School District has come to discuss with the committee their extensive reuse of the basic school plan. Again I will say for the record, as I have said before, much help can be gained by the committee in evaluating the state aid program by looking to what locally financed districts have been able to do. Dr. Peterson, you go ahead and informally discuss with the committee the idea you have and then we will ask some questions.

DR. PETERSON: All right. We started this program in late '52 and the first school was designed by a local architect and the fee was eight per cent. We worked very closely with him on it and this was approximately the net results.

The school consists of thirty-two thousand feet and it was built for ten dollars and forty-one cents. That included practically everything with the exception of the fencing.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Everything but the fencing?

DR. PETERSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Did it include site development?

DR. PETERSON: No, not the play area development, although there were certain black top areas that were included.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: How about the landscaping, the lawns and

trees?

DR. PETERSON: No, the landscaping is usually done with the maintenance group. We worked very carefully on the heating, plumbing, types of tile to be used throughout, and did everything we possibly could to keep the cost of this building down.

Then, following the letting of this contract, we took - we had another need for tenclass rooms so we just took this part of the plan and put it out for bid, paid the architect three and a half per cent, and that particular job was the George Washington, and it went for nine dollars and sixty-one cents.

ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI: That is stucco type?

DR. PETERSON: Fram stucco, ceramic tile floors and wainscoting in the toilets, asphalt tile throughout, individual weather conditioning units in each classroom with the exception of the kindergarten area.

We have two kindergarten rooms down here, and these are three wings of five classrooms and they are all typical. This is the multi-use room with the kitchen and this is the administration area. Now, during the construction we found that the administration area was a little small so we revised the plans extending it and made some minor improvements and again put the plan out for bid, although we did have to relocate it on the site because the next site faced west, whereas the original faced north. For that we came to an agreed price of approximately fifteen hundred dollars for the necessary revisions and utilities and the structural foundations and so forth, and then paid him three and a half per cent, two per cent for supervision and the other one and a half for minor changes, and that job went complete, the seventeen rooms, for ten dollars and sixty-

two cents. Before it was really completed we fell heir to a little federal funds. Of course, we had need for many more class rooms and so we duplicated the same job with the exception of leaving off one class room wing, one toilet room wing, and that was the John Adams built on government funds for nine dollars and eighty-six cents.

MR. KEATING: How many class room in that, please?

DR. PETERSON: Ten in the John Adams and no kindergarten. There were just straight ten class rooms, a multi-use and administration and one toilet room. You see this particular plan has a toilet room at each corner.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Your toilet facilities are completely separated from your other units?

DR. PETERSON: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Do you feel that is an economy feature?

DR. PETERSON: That is what our staff prefers because they can on the complete unit cend first, second and third graders to this one and the larger ones to the other one. It is very flexible in their program.

Then, we had need for the complete school in another location which was the John Tyler, and that one was built complete, in fact, this is actually a sketch of the Tyler. It was built complete for nine dollars and fifty-one cents, and the architect was paid three and a half per cent.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: How do you account, Mr. Peterson, for the range from nine-forty one to ten sixty-one on different reuses?

DR. PETERSON: That is very easy. In the first place, your class room areas are much more cheaply constructed.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And that is the reason - I was thinking that.

DR. PETERSON: When you go into the multi-use - here is an illustration on the ten room job on the George Washington that was built for nine sixty-one. On the original contract there were only the ten class rooms.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Multipurpose?

DR. PETERSON: Then a year later we took the same multi-use plan and put it out for bid by itself and the cost of that multi-use room was thirteen dollars and four cents. Well, your kitchen is one of the most expensive parts of it. We figure about sixteen dollars a foot when we get into kitchens, and, of course, there are two small toilets in the multi-use which increases the cost, too. So you can see when these buildings are built complte, the price is fairly consistent.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Apparently I missed one of the points you made becuase I was thinking from the prices you have given and the projects you detailed that your simple reuse of the classroom building had run you more than your entire project, but apparently you also had the multi-use room.

DR. PETERSON: The multi-use and the administration are both costly.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What is your administration cost?

DR. PETERSON: Well, it's chopped up into different offices, you know.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What sort of construction inside do you have? Do you have maple paneling or walnut paneling?

DR. PETERSON: Douglas fir wainscoting throughout to door height, seven feet. Above that is plywood construction. I don't think there

is any difference between the plastering and sheet rock.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I mean in your administration office?

DR. PETERSON: The same thing. Of course, our kindergartens are more expensive, too.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Do you have any home economics or any lab shop or--

DR. PETERSON: This is only one to six.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: I see.

DR. PETERSON: We have a problem I was going to explain to you when we got through with this regarding our junior highs.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: That is one through the sixth grade then?

DR. PETERSON: So that now we have under construction - we have the same job again with the exception of one class room wing and one toilet room, the kindergarten's being built and the rest of it is complete, and that price has gone up to ten sixty-two.

However, the Herbert Hoover, the second original reuse of the plan was ten sixty-two and that was completed two years ago. There will be a variation even though you do use exactly the same plan because there are different soil conditions. In one area your foundations will maybe go down five feet and in another area they might go down two, and then there is always a little difference in the cost of utilities. Sometimes the main service panel will have to be located in a different area, depending on the sources of supply. Of course, practically every time we reuse the plan there is a change of design in the structural and in the mechanical.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate that, but that you have accom-

plished on one and a half per cent architect with two per cent--

DR. PETERSON: Yes, with the exception of other minor changes that we agreed to at a set price. Another thing that changes the cost of these things considerably is the fact that most of our construction is outside the city of Stockton, which always leads to a sanitary problem, and a storm drainage problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You have more facilities, you have longer sewer lines and connecting lines?

DR. PETERSON: Some of them don't have sewer lines. In this particular job we finally did work out a deal with a reclamation district in this area where they put in a pump for us back on the river, but we had to put in a lot of storm water lines that ordinarily wouldn't go into a job, especially if it was within the city limits.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: All of that has been included in your cost?

DR. PETERSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: May I make this observation then and you tell me if it correct, that on your complete reuse of your basic plan for fifteen class rooms, two kindergarten, two toilet rooms, your multi-use room and administration, you have ranged from ninety sixty to ten sixty roughly in cost?

DR. PETERSON: That is correct. Our average has been around ten dollars and thirty cents.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And that includes a complete multi-purpose room with cafeteria in it?

DR. PETERSON: In the multi-use room we did include the in-wall tables. Prior to that time we were too poor to buy them so we made a

hundred of them with our own maintenance crew.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Do you think the in-wall tables are less expensive than the movable tables?

DR. PETERSON: Yes, over a period of time. The custodial time is cut down, although we use the type that are detachable from the wall, the same tables and benches they use for the group meetings as well as chairs that are stored.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: How much difference, do you think there is in the cost between the in-wall type and the movable type?

DR. PETERSON: Well, you cost is very near the same, but with the movable type--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The initial equipment cost is about the same?

DR. PETERSON: But, with the other type you have to have adequate storage room for them, and at ten dollars a foot, that is something to take into consideration.

MR. KEATING: That is in-wall tables - what was the cost of the ones you bought?

DR. PETERSON: The last ones we bought I think ran four hundred twenty-five dollars.

MR. KEATING: They were nine hundred dollars at one time.

DR. PETERSON: They were way up. Originally I had figures for a hundred. We needed a hundred and the best price I could get was around six hundred seventy-five dollars. That is by buying a hundred. So when I set up some of the maintenance crew and we built them for around two hundred thirty dollars, they are nothing to be ashamed of either. They are really tops.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is interesting.

DR. PETERSON: But, of course, we are not supposed to be in the manufacturing business, but when you only have so much money and it has to go so far, you have to make it stretch.

On this bond program, it was 1950 - a bond issue was passed for eight million eight hundred thousand dollars, and a certain percentage was allocated to each school and they were promised so much. In the meantime construction costs went up and we really had to do some scratching in order to get down and stay within our limits and keep our promises to the different areas, but it was done and we now have a new bond issue coming up on the seventh of next month, seven and a half million dollars, and that will be used primarily on our junior highs.

I might add, too, that we also have and have constructed in the last two years, sixty-five portable class rooms.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: In addition to these? That is interesting.

DR. PETERSON: Now, it's happened some of these areas have grown so rapidly. You take the Herbert Hoover, before we got it finished we had to move in three portables. Now, on the Grover Cleveland, there was another seventeen room job.I didn't mention that here because it wasn't on a reuse of this plan. We had to put in six the minute it was finished and they are still there.

MR. KEATING: Have you moved any of the portables since you put them up?

DR. PETERSON: I moved five.

MR. KEATING: What did it cost to move them?

DR. PETERSON: Around two hundred dollars.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Per class room?

DR. PETERSON: Yes. The cost of moving them depends on the route of travel. Of course, you always have to have P.G. & E and the telephone man and so forth, and the wires have to be cut, so it is pretty hard to make a set clost.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What was your per square foot cost on your movables?

DR. PETERSON: Six fifty.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Do you consider that a temporary room or a permanent room that has movable characteristics?

DR. PETERSON: Well, I think Mr. Finch is back there - I think it is pretty permanent, although they are portable. I think they will be in use for a long time and they are very adequate.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Permanent of twenty years nature-temporary of twenty-year nature?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Are they approximately the same plan in the interior as your permanent rooms?

DR. PETERSON: The same plan to this extent - the class room sizes in order to make them easily movable in the narrow streets and so forth are twenty-four by forty, which makes them quite rectangular, although by the use of movable cloak cabinets and so forth it eventually tends to square up the room and the teachers are very happy with them. Now, whereas these (pointing to diagram) are more of a square room, they are thirty-one by thirty - they are nine hundred sixty square feet of floor area in them--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thirty by thirty-two.

DR. PETERSON: Well, it breaks in there about thirty-one six by thirty-one six. There are nine hundred sixty feet.

MR. KEATING: You have all open corridors?

DR. PETERSON: That is right, with the exception - well, this is considered an open corridor, although it does close off as it passes down through the main building.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: In computing your per square foot cost, you took your covered area at one half and you did not include any of that totally uncovered?

DR. PETERSON: Oh, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I wanted to be sure because we want correct data.

DR. PETERSON: We used the same method as the Division of School House Planning.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You say forty some odd portables you made?

DR. PETERSON: Sixty-five.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And you moved five of them.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: All fram construction?

DR. PETERSON: Frame and stucco. The portables were not fram and stucco.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: Were they frame?

DR. PETERSON: Wood frame and rustic.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Mr. Peterson, with all of your buildings on the outside of the city limits, all of these building types, did you run into any different problems in building in the city or county?

DR. PETERSON: No, we just completed this John Adams and it was

right on the outskirts of the city. In other words, the center of the street was the dividing line, so we had our area taken into the city.

We have another little problem down there that might be interesting. We have an agreement with the city in responding to our fires, and on a building like this, with this agreement and by supplying adequate fire protection to conform to the requirements of the Pacific Fire Rating Bureau, we have been able to cut our insurance costs on a building of this type by about fifteen hundred dollars a year. So we make every effort to conform.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Have you had the same architect each time?

DR. PETERSON: No, we haven't. The plans become the property of the Stockton Unified School District. In this particular case the original architect passed away about two or three months after the first two contracts were let, and we had to pick it up with a different architect.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That raised a good question.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: I wondered if it was on bid with the idea they knew it would be three per cent.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: After the first architect passed away, did your newly hired replacement architect use the same set of plans on this three and a half per cent basis?

DR. PETERSON: Oh, yes. The plans belonged to us and every time that I reuse the plans I make two sets of osloids before the tracings are changed so we have practically two sets of tracings of this job. We do have a complete set of two osloids on each one, and that serves two purposes. It gives me the exact locations of all of the piping and everything for our

maintenance crew and we can always run off extra prints for them and we have a complete record of everything that is in the ground, which is very important after these things begin to get old.

MR. KEATING: How long does it take you to get a set of plans from the time you think of a school on a site to get a set of plans out to bid from the time you first give it to the architect and before you get it to bid- the reuse of your plans? Does that expedite it?

DR. PETERSON: Oh, it does make a big difference. If we are in a hurry we can have them on the market ready for bidding in three months.

MR. KEATING: Three months. And how long does it take to construct those repetitive plans now into a school after you let it to bid?

DR. PETERSON: On the complete school as a rule the contractors figure about a year. On this particular school, the Tyler, the completion date was February 4, yet we moved into the school on the 16th of September. We were all in and in operation, but the completion date was February 4.

MR. KEATING: How fast was that building constructed then?

DR. PETERSON: About seven months.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: From the time you broke ground so to speak?

DR. PETERSON: That is right.

MR. KEATING: Seven months for construction and three months for planning is ten months.

DR. PETERSON: And it can be shaved a little bit.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: You don't have the element of the weather so much as some of the areas.

DR. PETERSON: I don't know. We had a good one last week.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: But, I mean you don't have the desert sands and winds and the snow in the north and a lot of torrential rains that some people have.

DR. PETERSON: No, the rainfall isn't too great down there, but the adobe is terrific.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Let me ask you this, Dr. Peterson, do you find that on the reuse or lets put it this way, when you are letting bids for a reuse program, do you find the same contractor bidding a little tighter figure?

DR. PETERSON: I do.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Do you find that the lowest bidder is the one who has previously built the same plans for you?

DR. PETERSON: We have had one contractor now who is on his third job.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: He consistently comes in with a low bid because he has the experience?

DR. PETERSON: It has another advantage. Most of our contractors, subcontractors, are local and after they go through a job they know all about it, except for the minor changes we make.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Basically they know what they are in for?

DR. PETERSON: That is right.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Last week we let a bid for the administration building of a district of ten thousand students and the winning contractor was fifty dollars under the next lowest. There were ten contractors that bid, but the one who received it was only fifty dollars less. That would have been in several million dollars because it is the entire

administration building of the entire school district.

DR. PETERSON: We just let a contract for a million dollar class room at Stockton College and it was - well, in the final computation there was only three hundred dollars difference, but if you took the alternate that you shifted it around between three contractors, it was that close.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: We don't have trouble in over-bidding and things of that kind at all.

DR. PETERSON: Are there any other questions regarding the elementary?

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I will make an observation that Dr. Peterson has convinced me that certainly duplicate plans are being used down there and should certainly be applicable to other sections of the state. It is just a case of minor changes to make them applicable so far as contour of the land is concerned, is that right, Dr. Peterson?

DR. PETERSON: Well, a stock plan idea - personally I--

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I meant duplicate plans.

DR. PETERSON: This particular plan is very suitable to our area, but I wouldn't want to take and duplicate the thing up in Sonora or down in Oakland because you not only have a different topographic situation - I came back from San Diego. They don't have any heating problem at all.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What kind of heating units to you use?

DR. PETERSON: We use an individual furnace in each class room.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Forced air?

DR. PETERSON: With summer - winter operation so you can get ventilation. Then in the kindergarten area we use the forced air and also

radiant heating. We have one forced air unit in the administration.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is the same as they are using in Orange County. I think for all the major populace areas of California, with the possible exception of San Francisco, that climatology is not so different, but what almost the same heating or building type would be perfectly adequate, excluding the mountainous areas and desert regions which have extreme conditions, they they are not thickly populated either.

DR. PETERSON: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, that seems to cover it.

DR. PETERSON: Are you interested in our high school program?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: I am.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I think it would be very advisable. Let me ask this question first, Dr. Peterson, you have to get away by noon, do you not? I wanted to see if there is anyone here who expected to testify this morning who can't be back at two o'clock. Mr. Glantz, what is your situation?

MR. GLANTZ: I can be back, not tomorrow though.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You go right ahead then. I wanted to be sure if there was anybody here who had to speak before noon, we would hear them.

DR. PETERSON: This is a new program we are just getting into, and I imagine the state-wide will swing toward the high and junior high. This is our first job and it was a kind of rush deal so we had to let it in three contracts. This area down through here is the so-called administration area. Back here is the gymnasium. This is two shops and a large multi-use back here. We had originally planned on an auditorium, but

we later changed our mind and put a platform on the multi-use section which will be used for auditorium purposes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Is it an out-of-doors platform?

DR. PETERSON: Oh, no. Well, it is a so-called stage, but we call it a platform.

Now, this particular school on the academic section, it was let in three contracts, and it was done that way mainly because of the time element and we also had a very tough soil situation out there. It was built on a peat area where we had to excavate three feet of peat before we could start and then compact it with a suitable material before we could start construction. So the academic section, which includes the library and everything in the library with the exception of reading room tables, home making rooms, science rooms, our cost was nine dollars and seventy-five cents.

On the gymnasium, which does not include any of the gym equipment, but of course, otherwise is complete with locker rooms, showers, it was twelve dollars and ten cents. And on the music, multi-use shops, ten dollars and seventy-two cents. Now, the totalcost per square foot for the one hundred thirty-five thousand feet is nine dollars and eighty-six cents.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: That is the average?

DR. PETERSON: That is the complete high school. We have two more of them we are going to have to start construction on.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: How much was the architect's fees on that?

DR. PETERSON: We pay them seven per cent on the first seven hundred fifty thousand dollars, six per cent - no- six per cent on the

next five hundred thousand dollars.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: It graduates down.

DR. PETERSON: Originally we had planned one million eight hundred thousand. Then we eliminated the auditorium. We had figured three hundred thousand dollars for it. That left it, brought it down to a million and a half, and then through conservative planning, the complete job is going to run about a million two hundred and twenty thousand dollars. So we will be very near three hundred thousand dollars still to the good.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: How many high school students is that to accommodate?

DR. PETERSON: This will accommodate - it is planned for fifteen hundred, although we can handle seventeen hundred.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You say you do have a type of multi-use room with a platform in it. How many students would that accommodate and what would you use it for?

DR. PETERSON: These multi-use rooms are fifty by ninety feet.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Is that the same plan as in your elementary multi-use?

DR. PETERSON: No, this is a good deal larger. We are figuring on seating five hundred.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: So you could hold student body assemblies in two or three sessions?

DR. PETERSON: Yes.

MR. KEATING: How many class rooms were in there, Dr. Peterson?

DR. PETERSON: Thirty-five.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Plus your shops?

DR. PETERSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: You don't have the demand with as many schools as you have in Stockton for community use of an auditorium such as some smaller town do. In a lot of the smaller towns we conceive an auditorium to be a necessity as far as serving the public is concerned, because it is the only place that a lot of entertainment for the public can be held.

DR. PETERSON: Well, an adequate platform area in a good multi-use room can readily serve the same use.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: You have facilities, but in other areas they would need to have an auditorium that would seat seven hundred fifty to a thousand adults for service to the community. They pay the taxes and they vote the bonds and it is what they want for a central place for a lot of entertainment that is of cultural value to the community.

DR. PETERSON: That is right.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: So that multi-purpose serves that type where it wouldn't serve another type of school.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate that. It would depend upon the community and what other community facilities may be available. Any other questions or comments?

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: Those plans will belong to your district, then? You could use them again?

DR. PETERSON: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: At a fee basis, wouldn't you? You have a certain fee they would charge to use those plans again, the architects?

DR. PETERSON: That fee is not set yet. The tracings belong to us, but we have based all of these on three and a half per cent. There has been a certain amount of protest, yet none of the architects have turned them down.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Tell me, can a contractor do the work from one of those osloid sets?

DR. PETERSON: Well, the osloid is just a duplication of the tracing. In other words, we can continue to print plans from the osloid.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: From which the contractor and subcontractor can work?

DR. PETERSON: Oh, yes. But, I keep the osloids mainly for our maintenance staff.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I just wanted to be sure in my own mind what you could do with those osloids.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Do you have a central maintenance staff, or does each plant have an entity of its own?

DR. PETERSON: No, we have quite a large maintenance staff.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Centralized?

DR. PETERSON: Yes, large maintenance yard with shops, and we do a lot of our own work.

MR. KEATING: Have you any double sessions at Stockton?

DR. PETERSON: Yes, we have double sessions due to a delay that occurred on our last contract of portables. The completion date was supposed to have been around the first of September, and due to the lumber strike and other difficulties, they are not all complete yet. Some of them are in use and some of them aren't. In fact, I intend to take twelve of them

either this afternoon late or tomorrow, and it is in those areas that we have double session at this time.

MR. KEATING: When they are completed, you will be off the double session?

DR. PETERSON: That is right.

MR. KEATING: How many have you on double session as of the latest date?

DR. PETERSON: I'd say we had about twenty classes.

MR. KEATING: On double session?

DR. PETERSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Your unified district?

DR. PETERSON: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Your plans do not have to be submitted to and signed and approved by the Office of School Planning, is that correct?

DR. PETERSON: No, the only, practically the only connection we have with the Division of School House Planning is that on these federally financed jobs, but our relationship with those people have been quite satisfactory.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, that does raise another question. You have had some federal aid as you mentioned before.

DR. PETERSON:Yes, we had, in fact,this segment of this contract is being financed with federal funds (multipurpose area).

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And the John Adams and the John Tyler were federally financed?

DR. PETERSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, now, was it necessary - as you indicate, I guess it was necessary to consult with the Office of School Planning on those federal projects ?

DR. PETERSON: We had to get their approval before we could obtain the money.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I take it you used the same basic standard plan for the federal project, the same as your locally financed project?

DR. PETERSON: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Were there any suggestions made as to changes that appeared to be desirable to the Office of School Planning?

DR. PETERSON: Well, there was one drastic change that we made there and it cost us a little extra money. It wasn't too serious, but in our original planning of the kindergartens we had provided one kindergarten room and the other room was set up as a library, but provisions were made, the plumbing was roughed in, the heating was in, so it could be changed over to a kindergarten room at any time. And, of course, the Division of School Planning do not recognize libraries in elementary schools, and they insisted that we change that over, which we did, and it is being used as a kindergarten room, and we have put library shelving in this particular room and it is kind of a combination room and library room. The only other change that was made was that we formerly had one door to the class room and they requested two.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: As a matter of - in your standard basic plan that you have used for these several schools, you have one door for the classroom?

DR. PETERSON: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: But, in the federal project the Division of School Planning requested two doors per class room?

DR. PETERSON: Only in the two kindergarten rooms.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What kind of lighting do you use in your standard school plans?

DR. PETERSON: That is quite interesting. Originally the requirements of the school planning were a little ambiguous, I think, regarding the use of incandescent and slim line lighting. We have found that we are more satisfied with slim line lighting, although we do not light our classroom to forty foot candles. We only supply supplementary lighting so that our minimum lighting throughout the month of December, taken maybe at two thirty to three thirty in the afternoon is about twenty-eight foot candles is the lowest we found and we accomplish that with one row of slim lines in each class room. In another area throughout where we figure there might be night use or more adequate lighting is required, then we do supply the two rows, but we have been sticking with incandescent - I mean fluorescent slim line.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Slim line is a type of fluorescent?

DR. PETERSON: It makes a big difference in the amount of copper that goes into the building and it makes a big difference in the light bill, of course.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Was there any reluctance on the part of the Office of School Planning to approve that same type of lighting for your federal project?

DR. PETERSON: That, I can't too well answer because when the architect came up, whether they questioned it or whether it was only his

own idea, his own interpretation, I don't know, but he mentioned the slim line, that they wouldn't go for it. It means if the system of lighting is more expensive than concentric rings - well the system of lighting in most of these jobs is actually cheaper because of the savings in the copper and in the matter of makeup for the fixtures it runs more, but we never - I never got into any arguments with them about it. We put it in that way and that is the way we got it back. The only one I argued with was the architect.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is interesting, but you did go ahead and use the same type oflighting in the federal as in your others?

DR. PETERSON: That is correct. There was one other thing came up. I think it was foolish, and I think it could very easily be settled. That was the amount of cabinet work that would be permitted in each class room. I don't know for sure exactly what it says - twenty-five lineal feet of cabinet work. It doesn't say whether it can be two feet high or fifteen feet high or ten feet deep or whether it has doors on it. It is so many feet. Well, in our particular case we were probably twenty feet over in length, but it is very simple cabinet work and at the time we put it out for bid we had to take this additional cabinet work under the north windows out of the bid and put it in an alternate with the agreement that the school district would pay for it out of their own funds, which we did, and after the thing was all set, the government representative says, "Oh, forget it. We will pay for it." So it finally got in anyway.

MR. KEATING: You stayed within your allotment of the federal funds?

DR. PETERSON: Oh, we had to give too much money back. I'm still

sick.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Dr. Peterson, I would like to refer back to what you said just a minute ago to be sure it is emphasized for the record. You say that with the difference in amount of copper wiring that is necessary for the concentric ring and the slim line fluorescent you are able to sufficiently offset the normally greater cost of fluorescent fixture so that your initial construction cost for the fluorescent system was actually equivalent to or somewhat less than the concentric ring?

DR. PETERSON: That is correct, as long as we get by with the one row of slim lines. But, if we put in two rows, that wouldn't be the case.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I see. But your single row--

DR. PETERSON: One row is adequate.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Your one row is adequate with window lighting?

DR. PETERSON: Yes. You see, this always faces south.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is your south exposure?

DR. PETERSON: Yes. It isn't often they really have to turn the lights on.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Even on a foggy day?

DR. PETERSON: Another advantage of the slim line fixtures, you can very near leave them on all day cheaper than you can turn them on and off three or four times. In that way you save the cost of the tubes. It is harder on the tubes than to have them on.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, I think you have brought out some very interesting observations, Dr. Peterson. We are certainly indebted to you for taking your time to come and present this information to the

committee. It is twelve o'clock. If there is no one who has to testify before leaving for some distant point, we will recess until two o'clock - Dr. Bursch indiates he would like to make a short statement.

DR. BURSCH: The proper interpretation of the comment in regard to the federal aid project seems to me cannot be made unless it is understood that the planning office has a fine working relation with the United States Office of Education, that any project, no matter in what kind of a district it is in, will be screened, reviewed and approved exactly on the basis as the controls of state aid projects. So the comment is not a comment of relationship between the Planning office and the Stockton District. It is a comment of the relationship of the Planning Office to the state aid program. That is what I wanted to say. It seemed to me that in the light of the comment that was made, without that knowledge it might look altogether different than in fact it was.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I am not sure we heard all of that. Pardon the interruption, Dr. Bursch. If you would restate that to be sure we get the gist of it.

DR. BURSCH: What I am saying, the comment in regard to the Planning Office review of the Stockton project, the Stockton federal aided project, what was done is not a typical illustration of what the Planning Office would do in connection with a Stockton project that was not federally aided. In other words, for every federal aided project which has to have the approval of our office, that is, all of them must have the approval of our office, and our firm working relation is that we will review those projects in content of facilities and in amount of facilities per child, and in the number of class rooms there must be for a given unhoused population,

and for the lighting system and the library and all that, reflects what we do with state aided project and reflects nothing else. It reflects no finding of the need in Stockton. Our finding had no reference to the need in Stockton. It had reference to the comparability of that federal aid project with all state aid projects. I mean you have to see that.

Now, the question of the library, not wishing to contradict Dr. Peterson, the Planning Office is for libraries in elementary schools. We have been for them for twenty-five years, and we are for them today, but there isn't enoughsquare foot of area in the state aid project to get a library. That is an important characteristic of the review that needs this correction I am making - not to correct you, but to orient what you said to the facts that actually exist in that review that we make.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate that, Dr. Bursch.

DR. PETERSON: I am not very familiar with the requirements of School Planning because that is the only contact I have ever had with them. Our contacts have always beengood.

DR. BURSCH: I have had several reports from our staff in recent months that we are working with you on other projects and I would say from our view what you said, that our relationship has been satisfactory without reference to whether it is federal aided or not.

All the questions you raised about federal aid is not due to our office. It is due to state aid requirements. That is the point I want to make.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Just one question occurs to me before we do recess for lunch. Dr. Peterson, would your district, which is, of course, a locally financed district, have any objection - this is sort of a hypothetical question. I am not sure that I even appreciate the implication myself.

But I will throw it out for what it is worth, would your district have any objection to making available an osloid copy of a set of plans if there were a central office, so that other districts that might be on a state aid program might use them?

DR. PETERSON: I couldn't answer that question. That would be up to the school board.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate it would be a school board decision to make, but you might have some opinion on it. You see what I am thinking of rather vaguely is the possibility that others such as this district that came in and testified from up north, where they have had no experience in a building program, might come to a central office that would have on file a hundred sets of osloid plans that have been good examples of economical use of space and materials in other districts and they could look them over and say, "This looks like a set of plans that might be adaptable with a minimum amount of difficulty in our area. We will draw that from the file and submit it to an architect and see what changes have to be made for our district." Do you think there is anything feasible in that idea?

DR. PETERSON: I would rather not answer that one.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: All right. That is your choice. We stand recessed until two o'clock.

(Thereupon the noon recess was taken.)

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1954, 2:00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

---oOo---

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: If the meeting will come to order, we will reconvene the subcommittee on the subject of school construction. I would like to recognize the attendance of Assemblyman Vernon Kilpatrick, who with us this afternoon. He is a member of the committee. I would like to call Dr. Peterson who testified just before we recessed for lunch. He has a couple of comments he wishes to make by way of elaborating or correcting some testimony given this morning.

DR. PETERSON: I just wanted to correct that statement I made regarding architects on that Daniel Webster High School. They were eight per cent for the first seven hundred fifty thousand dollars, seven per cent for the next five hundred thousand dollars and six per cent for the balance. It is amounting to approximately seven point five three per cent the way it is set up at this time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I see. Thanks very much. We appreciate getting the record straight on that.

MR. KEATING: What was the average?

DR. PETERSON: Seven point five three.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: On the one million two hundred thousand dollar project. It is right around that figure, I think you said. Mr. Glantz, will you come forward and present the testimony which you wish to give to the committee? I believe you have submitted a written statement with some written recommendations which I will make not of for the record. They will be included in the record so that the reporter will not have to take them down. Would you proceed with your comments, Mr. Glantz?

MR. GLANTZ: A. H. Glantz, School Building Consultant. That is my first statement. The second group, as you have in your list there is a group of recommendations, the most recent release by our advisory committee on school building economies that is constantly working in our county to try to lower this building cost.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is for the county of--

MR. GLANTZ: San Mateo County. I might say that I am charged with the responsibility of working with school districts and preparing state aid applications, advising school boards as to their general planning, and I also work with some of the schooldistricts that are eligible for maintenance and operation money in public law 874 and public law 815 for building purposes.

I would like to say before I get started on this, the trustee, I think his name was Nissen, made a remark this morning that I would like to elaborate on a little bit. I think he might have dropped a hint here that the School Planning Office is making demands possibly that are not economic probably in the general planning. I think in all my experience with the School Planning Office, I have found those people all to be very cooperative.

They normally advise as to the facilities that are needed for a minimum program and if a local school district does not want to do it, they don't have to even under state aid. I advised him after we left the place. I told him that I thought it would be well for him to call the office and have a representative there with their architect and really discuss these things that he claims the architect is quoting them as coming from the Office of School Planning, and straighten that thing out. They have never

actually had a meeting with the School Planning Office. I have been asked to read my statement. (Mr. Glantz proceeded to read his statement. At the end of the last sentence of the second paragraph of page 1 of his statement, Assemblyman Lyon asked a question as follows.)

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: May I interrupt at this point, Mr. Glantz, to ask what that is?

MR. GLANTZ: Well, I don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I am not aware that any subcommittee ever made such a study.

MR. GLANTZ: As near as I know, Assemblyman Lincoln made that study. I talked to his secretary once, that is all I know. She told me the study had been made, but no one has been able to get a copy of it.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We will check into that.

MR. GLANTZ: Now, this comment that I have made so far is no reflection on the State Division of Architecture, nor on School Planning, because neither of those agencies are legally charged with the responsibility of doing that screening. (Mr. Glantz then proceeded to read and upon completing the third paragraph on page one, he commented as follows.) And the state agency being a supposedly nonprofit organization and a service organization should do that at cost rather than at a profit. (Mr. Glantz then read the first paragraph on page 2.)

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: May I ask Dr. Glantz what this fifty-seven per cent means? You don't mean that the cost of an incinerator adds an additional firty-seven per cent?

MR. GLANTZ: Well, I can give you a breakdown on that exact incinerator, what it would cost.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I would appreciate it. This is meaningless to me.

MR. GLANTZ: First, this particular incinerator can be purchased. It is a package deal. It can be bought by the school district for six hundred sixty dollars installed less ten per cent complete. When it is placed in the general contract immediately it comes under the scrutinizing eye of the Division of Architecture. Therefore, it must be earthquake proofed. Well, the standard price of that particular incinerator that has been earthquake proofed raises the price another one hundred twenty-five dollars. Then we add the contractor - I used the figure of ten per cent for overhead, and profit,you add to that the eight per cent of the architect, and you arrived at that figure.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You meant the incinerator cost was increased by fifty-seven per cent?

MR. GLANTZ: That is right. It is a small item, but you take several of those in a school district. It was just an example. Along that same line we found here a while back an architect had put in everything from playground equipment down to the animal fertilizer that was used to plant the lawn with and the lawn, everything, a complete package deal, into the general contract, and this particular district was at one time on state aid and is applying at the moment for more state aid, but they felt that they were better off by buying the package deal. So, being a matter of board policy why they went ahead and did it, but we felt it was very poor practice. Fortunately most of the architects don't practice that, nor do the school districts.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I would just like

to ask Dr. Glantz whether he feels that the provision for an earthquake proofed incinerator is justified, whether it is worth while? Of course, if there is extra value come in why that would not be considered a part of any additional price.

MR. GLANTZ: Well, in my own opinion, normally the incinerator is out in some obscure corner around which the c hildren never play, or shouldn't be playing. Sometimes it is fenced off so the children can't get next to it. I can't see any point in its being earthquake proofed unless it is right up against the building and the children are around it. Possibly the one hundred twenty-five dollars will give them a stronger incinerator and will last longer because it is reinforced with steel.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: If you had an earthquake the next day and destroyed the incinerator, of course, your value would be gone right away.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: May I break in to ask Mr. Finch from the Department of Architecture - is it a legal requirement that an incinerator has to be made earthquake proof for schools?

MR. FINCH: If the incinerator is involved in an area where the school children are likely to be, but if the incinerator is off in a remote lot, it is not a school activity, so it would not come within the jurisdiction of the Division of Architecture. That is true.

MR. GLANTZ: You mean it is off the site.

MR. FINCH: No, it need not be off the site, just an understanding it is off the area of the school activities.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Our highschool before the earthquake had an incinerator by the high school gym. Ten thousand people

had to go by there, but it could very well be way over by the Griffith Stadium, clear off and around where no one would go.

MR. GLANTZ: You had quite a stack on it, forty or fifty feet, and, of course, that becomes a danger.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: But, it needn't have been there. It could have been far off, but as we had it there it would be part of the school structure.

MR. GLANTZ: This incinerator I am talking about, I think it has a total height not over about ten or twelve feet, a small package deal.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: Are these school properties insured?

MR. GLANTZ: Yes, as a rule - not for earthquake, I don't believe. Very few carry that. It is quite prohibitive.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: In that case, of course, the insurance rate would not come into play.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Glantz, then I believe you have really covered informally what you had set forth as your first written recommendation, is that right?

MR. GLANTZ: Yes, that is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Would you cover the others briefly?

MR. GLANTZ: I thought with your permission I had a few items here I just wanted to mention. In our checking of plans to bring out some of the points that I have just been talking about, and I could list a lot more of these if I wanted to, we did detect one time, and those were removed from the plans before they were approved by our office. There was one, an average sized elementary school that had seventeen different

sized windows in them, none of them stock sizes. We had quite a time with the architect. We finally got him to change it. He tried to tell us they didn't cost any more.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Why did he object to the stock item?

MR. GLANTZ: I don't think it was that. It just happened every window that came along was a window of a different size. He tried to tell us it didn't cost more to fabricate none stocked size windows. Well, any school kid can tell you differently.

Another item we have found in plans that we have insisted had to be changed - we have found tremendous glass exposed areas on the west, south and east where we know the solar heat problem would be tremendous and eventually the district would have to install drapes or some sun control at a cost. That was changed.

Also some of the glass in the area was down so low a child could fall through. It was double strength window in some cases and in other cases just plain pane. The answer we got from the architect was if it proves to be a danger, the district can put a railing in. We found in another case a small one room mountain school had quite an elaborate loud speaking system in it. These are things architects slip into the plans and very few school boards detect or check the plans.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Are these all examples in San Mateo County?

MR. GLANTZ: Yes. It is a small county. We found another case. This happened and we didn't find this until after the building was up, but the building contained eighteen to twenty inch steel I beams that were fabricated on a radius and you know that fabricating an eighteen inch I

beam is an expensive deal and it didn't serve any purpose in strengthening the building. It was purely aesthetics, and one of the trustees happened to be a member of a large construction firm. He didn't know it either until he visited the school, and he hit the ceiling when he saw that.

We have one more thing that I wanted to mention. We have one building now under discussion. It's been under discussion for over two months. We refused to approve it. In this particular building of this larger development the school planning office has also refused to approve it, but this particular architect throws the book away when it comes to being practical and he wants to be aesthetic in most cases. This one building has ten thousand two hundred thirty square feet in it. Fifty-four per cent of that footage is corridor which goes no where. It is a circular corridor. It is a beautiful thing to look at.

Now, if they would apply the same amount of corridor space to that particular building as they are doing over here in the academic building, this happens to be a music building I am talking about - the percentage of corridor space there is an average of twenty-three point six per cent corridor, for space they would have in that building, they would have seventy-seven hundred usable square feet in the place of forty-seven hundred, three thousand more square feet of usable space.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is a locally financed building?

MR. GLANTZ: Definitely. Well, the state aid just wouldn't make any bones about it. They wouldn't do it. They are trying to push it through. We are standing pat and School Planning is standing pat, but those are the things you run into.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Glantz, you have raised a very interest-

ing point, I think, indirectly. That is this. Do you think it would serve any useful purpose and be practical to have in the county superintendent's office a well qualified roving building inspector who would be called upon and who would have to be called upon by the individual districts within the county for consultation during the course of their program and then during the course of their construction of their various programs? Do you think that we would have a little closer liaison and be able to effect a little tighter use of money in those various school districts within the county?

MR. GLANTZ: Well, I think the thing that would help the most would be what we recommended here and that is a qualified structural engineer, for instance, and probably have some mechanical engineers on the side, too, that can check the mechanical features.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: In some of these outlying areas do they have qualified people. Some of these problems come up before the building even starts. I know this man this morning - these schools don't have qualified people on the local level.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is the real problem. This is why I raised the question I did. Obviously many of the local elementary districts don't have. They are just too small. Mythinking would be that a county like San Mateo where you have a number of small districts, the county might well provide such service. In other words, you might have a qualified licensed structural engineer in your county office who would be available, and as a requirement be available to the individual small schooldistrict for consultation when they start to work on a building program, at the time or before they call in an architect.

MR. GLANTZ: I could see in our setup over there, I can see a structural engineer working a hundred per cent of the time between Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties and being busy all the time. Out county is too small, I think, to have a man of that caliber one hundred per cent of the time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That raises a good question, though. The numerous districts within the County of San Mateo probably over a period of a year will be engaging in several million dollars, or several hundred thousand dollars worth of construction?

MR. GLANTZ: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: If this qualified man could go over these various plans as they come in for preliminary inspection or preliminary checking by the county office before they go farther, if he just caught a few small items, he would justify a salary of twelve thousand dollars a year. He would pay his salary in one little job. And it seems to me it wouldn't take too large a county to very easily justify that.

MR. GLANTZ: He could be working with the local district and the local architect right there on the ground floor rather than running to Los Angeles or Sacramento.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Even in the mountain counties they might make a contract between two or three or four groups of supervisors. When they start importing these fellows they don't have to live with it and pay the taxes for it and be with it all the time. It is just a money making deal with them, but where you get someone who lives in the area and can sit down and talk with the people and who lives with it all the time, you have a different outlook.

ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI: Mr. Chairman, were you thinking about this in addition to the job inspector?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Yes, my first question did have some relation to the job inspector, but I think it is much broader and more basic to get to the point Mr. Glantz raises, that is, expert engineering and business consultation with the small districts that can't afford that sort of expert advice.

MR. GLANTZ: Do it in the planning stage.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: With their architect and board.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: I would like to ask, does this take special legislation?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, it may or may not, but it is a point that has not been looked into, Vernon.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: Already we have joint county hospital authority, and maybe the same pattern could be used.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: At the present time there is no requirement in the law, to the best of my knowledge, that a county office provide this kind of expert engineering and business management consultant service to the various small elementary district say within the county. If that were required it might conceivably pay for itself many times over. It is a thought that just comes up.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: It seems to me in that connection you should also have the proviso that if two or more counties want to join in such operation, they could do so.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Definitely.

MR. GLANTZ: There is this requirement in the Code that the county

superintendent must approve or reject all building plans within his county excepting city school districts.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is applying the iron door after the horse is stolen.

MR. GLANTZ: I would say all the counties but about two or three - our county and San Diego, and I heard about one other - actually really go into checking those plans instead of rubberstamping. Most places just rubberstamp. So there is a requirement that the county superintendent at least look at the plans; whether he does anything about it or not is another thing. I think this other could be a recommended added service, but on the other hand, these county offices have constantly been cut down on the money they have on which to operate, especially the county superintendents that recommend reorganization of school districts in doing away with the small districts and creating larger ones. Then the small school formula doesn't apply. We have a neighboring county that gets one hundred thousand dollars more money than our county office does on which to operate and they service probably half the youngsters that we do because they are larger schools, so the small school formula actually gives the superintendent a shot in the arm that wants to retain these little districts so he has more money to play with.

So we are having a pretty tough time because we are pushing consolidation as much as possible regardless of that formula. So the more we push it the more we are cutting our own throats, but we feel it is good business as far as the schools are concerned.

Now, this committee we have that I mentioned earlier, the committee on School Building Economies, did you want me to read this one? That

is the last group of recommendations compiled by the committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I don't believe it is necessary to read each one of those in order. The page that has one through five on it and six on the next page, you might touch those very briefly.

MR. GLANTZ: The first page - incidentally, this committee is composed of some eleven lay and professional groups, some of which are intimately connected with a school building field. They are in the contracting business and so on. We have trustees with the state school planning office on it and so on, taxpayers association, too, among others.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: On second thought after you finish that, give the reporter a break and read those six points. I think it might be well to do so.

MR. GLANTZ: All right. Now, No. 1, I touched on. I elaborated on it in my brief rmarks. I won't read the so-called supplement No. 1. I will read the second group of recommendations and this group of recommendations grew out of a series of meetings. Its hearings were augmented by a representative of the bi-county association of real estate brokers, a representative from a large subdivider, a representative from a county and city planning commission and a representative from a county and city recreation commission. When we got into this site study, these are the recommendations that have grown from that. (Thereupon Mr. Glantz read recommendations one through 6 in the Supplement No. 2 - Sites October 19, 1954.)

Now, in this No. 1 up here I might elaborate a little there. We have had a few cases in our county-as most of you know there are places in our county that are quite rugged. Sites are few and far between. Much of the

land, the flat land has been used in subdivisions and the local planning commissions have no power to force the setting aside of a site when a plan comes in. All they can do is continue to put off action until the subdivider gets tired of it and finally gives in and sets aside a place, a site for it on the plan at least.

We have had some cases where districts have been really stuck tremendously by a site that the subdivider - it was just too rough for him. It was too costly. He wanted to get rid of it. He pushed it off through political pressure and the other pressures pushed it off on one of the school districts. We had quite a time for some six months and the state planning officer was right in the middle of it. We were, too. We finally were able to stear the district away from purchasing of these sites that would have been expensive, extremely expensive sites even at a gift because of the development cost.

In this case if some skilled people were in on the thing right at the start, it would oftentimes save the district a great deal of money. Now, the way the code reads, the State Division of School Planning makes its recommendation as to a given site or out of two or three possible sites. And if the district doesn't want to adhere to their recommendation they can wait thirty days and do as they please. So it actually doesn't have too much teeth in it. I know of cases where that's happened.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Any further questions from members of the committee? Thank you very much, Mr. Glantz, for your very worth while presentation.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: May I ask Dr. Glantz a question. In your report here is this something that you have been working on in the

past, or is this a result of invitation extended you by the subcommittee here to appear before the committee?

MR. GLANTZ: Well, I got the invitation, I think it was Tuesday, Monday or Tuesday, and I sat down and threw this stuff together. Were you talking about my background?

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I am talking about the material you are recommending here as a result of the activities of this committee that has provoked your thinking in that direction, or have you been doing research?

MR. GLANTZ: The last three pages the committee has been working steady now for over a year and a half - the second Tuesday of every month. Any time you are in our area and want to drop in on us, you are certainly welcome.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The same committee did submit some information to us at our January hearings.

MR. GLANTZ: That was the first group of recommendations and this is the second. We are still on sites, however. We are going into it deeper.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Thank you, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thanks very much. I believe, although it is not on the planned portionof the program, Mr. Mayo, an architect from Stockton who was here observing the meeting this morning asked for a few minutes to make some comments to the committee, so Mr. Mayo, would you step forward?

MR. MAYO: I withdraw my request because the question I had has been answered by Mr. Peterson. He made the corrections which I wanted

to make. That seemed to be the most important.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: All right. Mr. Jaqueth, will you come up and give us the benefit of some of the off-the-cuff and spur-of-the-moment observations with respect to the program that Dr. Wright was touching upon this morning.

MR. JAQUETH: Mr. Chairman, my name is Herman Jaqueth. Inasmuch as most of the things you have talked about today are matters which are directly of interest to the State Allocation board, we, of course, are interested, too, and last evening Dr. Wright handed me a copy of the report which he gave to you people this morning, and in reading the matter over, there are some thoughts which we have and maybe that the board is interested in receiving, or which might be helpful to you to know - just experiences we have received along the lines of having worked for the Allocation Board.

Generally the basis of having funds appropriated to the schools on a lump sum basis such as is given here sounds like it might be a very simple way of doing things, and it might be a way which would make things very much easier, especially for the school districts and especially for the State if the members of the Legislature of the State were agreeable to opening things up in that manner.

Perhaps a little history is needed in review of the state aided programs at this time. I think most of you were here as members of the Legislature when Chapter 1575 was passed. I don't know that you were, Mr. Lyon.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I read the history of it.

MR. JAQUETH: I think probably all of you heard of that program wherein twenty million dollars was provided by the Legislature in 1947,

and then later that amount was augmented by thirty million, becoming fifty-five million dollars, and it is generally known by school districts and called Chapter 1575 program. That was entirely a grant in aid program and in that program the district needed to establish itself for eligibility by being up to its bonded indebtedness and then they would be eligible to receive state aid.

There were a flood of applications immediately after those funds, or even before the funds became available. No provisions were put in the act upon the part of the state as controls or limitations and consequently it became a program of first there with the application was the first to be served.

There was such a need and such a demand that it was necessary for the State Allocation Board merely to list the applications and the amount they had applied for in the order in which they had applied and then after servicing the applications the apportionments were made.

However, as a result of that program the next program came into being. That was called Chapter 1389, and those of you that were here at the time will recall that there were very few limitations placed in that particular bill by the Legislature to begin with.

At the beginning the two hundred fifty million dollars as provided under the constitutional amendment was to be allocated or apportioned by the State Allocation Board and at the time of the passage of the bill, members of the Legislature then became very much interested in the provisions of the bill and it finally went to free conference. As a result in the free conference there were very many arguments presented pro and con concerning the limitations which should be placed in the bill and it

finally ended up with such limitations in the bill, controls as were placed there. But the various committees in the assembly and the senate that reviewed that particular bill were insistent that there be some controls and they were so placed in the bill.

Later came what is called now Chapter 19. That is the Legislative Act in connection with the one hundred eighty-five million dollar bond fund, and here again various controls were placed in the bill by members of the Legislature, and since that time, I believe, there has only been one additional control put in and that is the one at the last extraordinary - I don't know whether it was extraordinary or special. It was rehabilitaion - Hatfield bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That was put in there in 1953.

MR. JAQUETH: So that, to us, is an indication that the Legislature takes some interest, at least, in giving some indication to school districts as to what they can have or what they may not have. I am speaking about these matters in connection with the open end suggestion that was made this morning. Don't get the idea I am not for something of this kind or for something else. I am merely trying to explain to your our experiences that have come to us and our general knowledge of programs relating to state school aid building programs.

The present bills, both Chapter 1389 and Chapter 1575 is now passing out of the picture with practically all of those construction program completed, not all, but almost all of them are. Under Chapter 1389 and Chapter 19, it is possible for the Allocation Board under either one of those two bills to provide the open end idea that was spoken of this morning. In other words, in opening up thingsto the schooldistrict and let them

spend their own money in whatever way they wish, with the exception that each of the bills might need a general clarification of intent and purpose.

The attorney general's office has extended and given a statement that it was the intent and purpose of the Legislature from reading the preambles of the act and the very few paragraphs of the act, it was the intent of the Legislature to place some measure of control on school districts and as a result of that the rules and regulations have bee prepared attempting to provide by the Allocation Board rules and regulations funds which will produce average schools with average quality of construction.

In other words, it was to try to provide funds for medium class of construction, if you want to put it that way, trying to eliminate the most expensive types of finishes and these things that Mr. Glantz has been talking about and the other things which are talked about as far as expensive items and construction of schools is concerned. So it is possible presently within the - with either one of these two bills, if it is the desire of the Legislature, that they could be opened up and give more lee way to the schools.

Here is about what happens at the present time. I think that all you gentlemen know that a school district must be up to its bonding capacity, ninety-five, or within twenty-five thousand dollars of ninety-five per cent of its bonding capacity. We, for shortness, have called it the bonding capacity. So they have to be up to that before they are eligible for state aid, but the school also has its own budget and in that budget it has capital outlay amounts set forth. It also has special tax amounts which

are set forth in its budget and in its accounts for construction purposes and it may even have some other building construction amounts.

Now, in the event that the open end idea was presented and made available to the schools immediately, it would seem that there should be some control placed over these other school accounts because they are accounts which if left so-called open end, that would be transferred after being adopted by the Board of Supervisors, transferred within budget accounts from one place to the other, and the districts would by having these large amounts of their own set aside for other purposes, would then be asking for we might say, exorbitantly large amounts of state money.

That is just one point that was spoken of. Being open end control there should be less control on the part of the state, but that particular type of subject is covered in the two present acts by the statement that the Director of Finance shall review district accounts and set forth the State Allocation Board those amounts of district funds which should be applied toward application. Then the control of the school budgets - I think most of you are familiar with the school budgets, and it goes on to the Board of Supervisors, city councils.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Pardon me for interrupting, you don't mean County Board of Supervisors?

MR. JAQUETH: After it is passed to the school board, it goes on to the county for assessment purposes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The budget?

MR. JAQUETH: Yes, that is what I am talking about, the budget, and that elective group have little to do with the manipulation, we will say,

or changes that happen actually in the school budget itself. Maybe I didn't make that point clear. If this type of financing is made available to schools, it certainly should be looked at and given consideration.

Now there is another method which might be considered and that might be the leasing-purchase plan which could be made available. It is a plan which will be made available in the state to earthquake stricken area, Bakersfield, Tulare and so forth, in the way of state loans and are being repaid by those particular districts or cities to the state, who are repaying the revolving fund from which the loan was made and so naturally in the lease-purchase plan, there must be some sort of control, but in those bills and in those agreements very little control excepting the approval of the plans by the Department of Architecture, so that they will conform to the earthquake act, and that is another method of obtaining repayment and we understand that that would be available to school districts and could be made available to school districts through certain amendments to either one of the two acts if it was so desired by the Legislature.

There is one question as to what might happen to certain costs to a school district in the event the school district desired to rehabilitate its facilities and let's say that some nine hundred fifty dollars was the average amount set forth by the Legislature for a grant to the school for school house construction--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Per student?

MR. JAQUETH: Yes, and in the event of rehabilitation, the amount would be less or it would not be desirable or economical or practical for the school to rehabilitate, that brings up the Hatfield amendment, and

that does bring up another question there. I think I have discussed and tried to give you the opinions that we have concerning Dr. Wright's report this morning.

The first reaction in reading his report is that it becomes a gift and in the 1575 procedure and the change to 1389 and Chapter 19 it was not desirable as far as the Legislature was concerned to make gifts to schools any longer, that the loan principle was the method selected by the Legislature, and so if in accordance with the written discussion here, the state is to return to the gift program, it is a radical departure from the present thought of what we think was the thought of the Legislature. And being that type of program it would seem that it would need to be made available to those non-state aided areas such as the city of San Francisco, Los Angeles Sacramento, San Diego, Stockton and others as well as to the distressed school districts.

And that would mean then that an enormously large demand would be placed upon the bill and a larger sum would be necessary because the average cost of amount over nine hundred dollars per pupil multiplied by, I don't recall what the Department of Education is now estimating, three hundred fifty thousand or some such figures asthat of unhoused pupils would give you some indicatinn as to the amount of money necessary, and so I merely mention that as a thought from reading this, that it would seem that that would be the trend that the Legislature is going to in attempting to follow through on the report. I guess I have covered the other, the amounts.

THIS MORNING Mr. Collier mentioned the method of repayments and, of course it probably could be worked out somehow from this bill

as well as in the present bills. Another if I may--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Go right ahead. I was going to ask a questions. I think maybe I better right on this point - instead of this figure of nine hundred dollars per student, there was something of what you might call foundation program of four hundred per student that would be available to all districts which admittedly would not be sufficient for the complete program, but which would be a partial contribution to the building needs of all districts. Do you think there is any possibility of that plan working out, Dr. Wright's plan working out on that and evading the pitfalls?

MR. JAQUETH: The average cost has been a little over nine hundred dollars per pupil. The federal government is providing between twelve and thirteen hundred dollars per pupil and if you only provide four hundred dollars per pupil, if the average cost so far has been nine hundred, you have got five hundred unaccounted for somewhere.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: For the district to make up?

MR. JAQUETH: Yes, but the districts at the present time under Chapter 1389, they have met about thirteen per cent of the cost, and under the present Chapter 19, they are doing a little better. It is about twenty per cent of the cost now. So if you would up that figure so that maybe eighty per cent of the nine hundred fifty dollars was provided, then you would perhaps have enough money to pay for the cost of construction. If twenty per cent is being provided by the districts, there would be a remaining eighty per cent to be provided by somebody.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Isn't that nine hundred dollars per student a little bit high for an elementary school?

MR. JAQUETH: I don't think so, Mr. Lyon. Since the inception it

might be just a little. I would say generally it is the figure that runs through my mind. As I say, I may have it here. I didn't have time to dig out these figures too correctly, but we have been since the inception of this Chapter 19, where we have been required by the provision of the act to keep track specifically of maximum cost limits and to place limits of maximum costs on school districts, and we have kept track of actually the costs and made an average of each application, and as I recall, it was around nine hundred, a little bit more than nine hundred dollars per pupil.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That raises some very interesting questions because the Los Angeles city school district and San Diego City School District and I gather from some of the testimony from the Stockton Unified School District are all producing various adequate elementary plants for under six hundred dollars a student or in the range of six hundred.

MR. JAQUETH: So is the state if you leave out the same things they leave out.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What have they left out?

MR. J AQUETH: They are not including the cost of sites. He told you this morning they were not including the cost of sites. They are talking about the cost of the building only. The thing they are talking about is the contract that they let to the contractor to build ten or twelve class rooms. They are not talking about the site or the off site or on site improvements. You asked the question this morning did that include the paving of the site and the playground and they said it didn't. So if you add all those things in, it is going to be a little different figure.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is very true. I know that the Los

Angeles school district, however, does include all their black topping, their fencing and their landscaping in their figure, and the figure is about five hundred eighty-five dollars a student in some of those complete studies.

MR. JAQUETH: We have figures of four hundred some dollars per pupil without all these things you are including, four hundred ninety-three. That is nine hundred fifty against four ninety-three. That make a difference of almost five hundred dollars if you want to leave out all these other extra things.

MR. KEATING: May I ask, did you say the difference between the five hundred and the nine hundred fifty is the site development? Is that what you said?

MR. JAQUETH: There are many things in there, Mr. Keating, that come in extra.

MR. KEATING: It seems ninety per cent of your basic plant--

MR. JAQUETH: Los Angeles doesn't have outside corridors. They have no corridors at all.

MR. KEATING: They have open corridors.

MR. JAQUETH: Between one building and another. They very carefully include corridors, and they don't include in their costs these other costs, for instance, such as your utility improvements and that sort of thing. Right down the line I can give you the comparisons here - here are the items that were compared item by item for nonstate aid projects with state aided projects. The first is site development cost, the building area per pupil, class room load, net building cost per pupil, the multipurpose rooms, brick veneer, whether they have planting boxes or whether they don't, different types of heating, whether radiant or forced

air, whether they have a central heat control or whether they don't, and the basic structure itself, whether it is tilt up sled construction or frame and stucco, cabinet work, what type of cabinet work, is it built in or like you people might expect here to have in the state capitol building, whether they have a sink in the class room, type of doors, metal or wood, window areas as was spoken about here before. There are many districts that do go to a varied number of sizes of windows instead of using all the class rooms the same type and size. Also thether they have drapes in the class room, what type of hardware, whether it is luxurious sludge type or some other type of expensive hardware, or medium type cost of hardware; the tack boards, how much of that do they have and chalk boards and acoustical tile; whether they have asphalt tile or lineal tile on the floor. Well, these are items that we have compared back and forth and those items which go toward the actual construction of the building are included in the four ninety-three, and those items which, like the water mains and sewers and that sort of thing are included in the site development. And the difference is about five hundred dollars, so it does make a difference what you put in.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: I would like to ask Mr. Jaqueth if he has extra copies of that comparison.

MR. JAQUETH: We would be very happy to make them. We do not have it now but we can make this comparison and give it to the members of the committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Jaqueth, that is your basic outline for collecting data which you are now in the process of collecting?

MR. JAQUETH: These are the subheadings which we have compared

costs upon.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You are still in the process of making the study?

MR. JAQUETH: Maybe I should explain a little further that under Chapter 19 the State Allocation Board is required to set an established maximum cost. You people, I believe, are familiar with that provision being in the bill. All right. What is a maximum cost? We know it varies. We know up at Mount Shasta it is entirely different than it is in Sacramento or in Stockton or Orange County. And so naturally architects prepare plans. Just an example in this. An architect in Sacramento prepares a plan for Mount Shasta and he prepares a plan for Lodi. Perhaps the plan he's got for Lodi Area may come in a little above what might be the maximum cost figure per square foot at Lodi. So there are items then which in accordance with the construction standards he might remove to bring that cost down to be within the maximum cost of the structure. That is why we break these down into general subheadings that are subbed out to the subcontractors because the costs are clear. When they let a subconta to a plumbing concern, that amount is set out. We know what it is. We can see what it is. So it is with these other items. We can get a cost, for instance of vinyl floor as compared to basalt flooring. And if the architect has called in his wisdom for an alternate bid for these items, it is then clear which the district can select to keep their cost within limits.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is a very fine breakdown. We appreciate your bringing that to our attention. Did you have something further you were about to start on?

MR. JAQUETH: May I take just another moment, Mr. Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Yes, go ahead. I had one other question. This question is also just a little big different. I wanted to get your opinion as to whether or not you think it possible and would be advisable or feasible to reduce by some substantial percentage the present group ceilings which are in existence, say the thirteen dollars and some cents per square foot for a class room in the average group three cost area? Do you think that that could be reduced to eleven and a half or twelve?

MR. JAQUETH: Well, if you are asking simply could it be reduced, of course, the answer is yes, it could be but whether it is desirable is something else. Now, the average cost, this cost figure we speak of as thirteen fifty is now twelve eighty-six.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You have amended that down to twelve eighty-six?

MR. JAQUETH: Yes, that fluctuates according to cost of materials and labor.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate it is periodically amended.

MR. JAQUETH: Let's call it thirteen dollars per square foot, and that ranges up to probably nineteen with kitchens, and then goes on down probably to four and a half or five dollars for corridors and that sort of thing. However, the act says that the Director of Finance determines what these average costs are and makes its recommendation, and the board establishes these figures.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The Allocation Board actually passes on those after your staff has made a recommendation for the Director of the Department of Finance?

MR. JAQUETH: They could Now, whether or not the State Allocation

Board would desire to lower that cost figure, would be a matter for them to decide. We feel that this price is about the average price that could be determined from the present time from the existing costs of the lumber and material and steel and labor and that sort of thing. We feel that this price is justified at the present time fromthe returns that we are getting - we have not received all of the answers back yet that our field men are getting from the various non-state aided as well as state aided schools concerning this questionnaire which we are now circulating as a result of the allocation Board requesting the information. So we do have most of it here.

And to us the general indication so far is that most of the state aided districts are placing items in their construction programs very similar to the non-state aided. However, we are finding onsome items, basaltic tile, for instance, tile flooring is almost universally used by all of the non-state aided, and we will say in practically all of the State aided, but there are a few State aided that are requesting other types, more expensive types, but generally we are finding that the two types of programs are running along pretty close together, and there may be a few items such as this ceramic tile we use in gumnasiums and toilets and things of that kind that will vary a little bit, but generally we are finding that they are running along pretty close together. It is natural they would. After all, the same architects prepare the other plans as well as state aided plans, and the cost, I think, is running about the same. We keep as careful track as we can through all the trade journals of the costs of other projects, but it is a very difficult thing to ferret out just what each type of project is buying.

We have projects - I think it may be illuminating to this committee. If you don't have this report which is gotten out by the Office of the Superintendent of Schools of San Diego County, and it is called the Sampling of Current Practice in School House Construction, prepared by Mr. Hardisy. Well, there are some twenty projects included in this report of his of construction projects in the last two or three years. Now, about half of those are state aided projects, and the other half are not, and they are - some are by architects who have had nothing to do with state aided projects, and many of them are by architects that have both. Both are in here and he has listed-the county superintendent of schools of San Diego County breaks this down into quite a detailed fashion concerning foundations, exterior and interior roofing, corridors, heating, and lighting, electrical, daylight control, building construction cost. Now, the prices per square foot in here vary from about nine dollars up to twenty dollars a square foot.

There is a state aided project in here for San Diego County for nine dollars and thirty cents per square foot. There is a non-aided school project in here for over twenty dollars a square foot, but you have got to look at the things they are building.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: What they are getting for their money.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: One item or case might be an auditorium or cafeteria?

MR. JAQUETH: And further you have to look at what is inside. For instance, they may just build class rooms, and they may not put in we will say any cabinets at all. Some schools have done that. They

may not put in cupboards. Those things amount to about a dollar per square foot, so just to say something costs thirteen dollars and fifty cents a square foot is hardly a fair statement, or if you say ten dollars.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We realize that you have to itemize what you are talking about. Pardon me, before you get started on the next discussion, your office of local allocations has one or more architects that scan the plans as they come through in the state aided programs, do you not?

MR. JAQUETH: We have two, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And they scan for these items and other nonessential items. Do they also scan for the thing Mr. Glantz mentioned, that is, the overbuilding, the overstressing two or three or four hundred per cent of the minimum necessity under the Field Act?

MR. JAQUETH: That is right. In addition to Mr. Glantz' list that he gave to you - it fits in partially with the list - let me give it. I have about fifteenitems. Would you like to have me read these items that we look for in these plans? First, of course, is the requirement as to whether or not it meets the earthquake act and that comes as a directive from the Department of Architecture. If that isn't on there, we don't look further until we get that and sometimes it isn't there and we call up and find out when it will come. So that, of course, is first. Then is the use of elaborate heating devices. You would be surprised - we have had some schools that have had three types of heating devices in the same room - at least requested in the beginning.

Utility service is checked - the water, light, heat and the power, and whether that part of it is on the site or whether it is off the site. You

would be surprised at the number of school districts that want to build a separate special vault underground and deposit the meters and transformers and have all their wires underground, even though, in one school district, it is solid rock where this vault must be made in the ground. And so that is an example.

Cabinet work is one of the things which is very carefully looked at, and whether or not it is in the premium quality of hardware and fixtures, and, of course, we have to get that out of the fixtures itself. There is nothing mentioned in the plans excepting there will be doors, and whether or not the sun control devices are of elaborate type or whether they are of average type of whether any at all. That has to be checked for. Then there is the building features, such as recessed gutters and maybe they have aluminum recessed gutters and all that type of construction, or an unusual amount of ceramic tile. We have had some gymnasiums where the entire wall and ceiling was to be covered with ceramic tile instead of going up maybe a short distance from the floor; and also whether or not this acoustical tile you have up here, what type it is and how far up the wall it comes and where it is located; whether rubber tile or vinylite floor, in other words, the floor covering. And we have some school districts that want several coats of paint instead of maybe two or three coats of paint.

One of the things is the specifications requiring certain manners of placing sheeting on the wall so that the foundation sheeting perhaps could not be used under the stucco as it is built outside. There are a lot of little things of that kind. Our boys are not listed as architects. They are construction engineers, and the thing that we are looking for more or less

is to comply with the Hatfield Act and that means actually to find details of structural incapacity rather than this little type of thing here, so it isn't exactly an architectural problem, although he has an architectural background. So these are the things that we review and check off on these plans to determine the high cost and whether or not the building is over or under. We have had some schools that have come in and said, "We will not put in any type of floor. We will harden this surface and later on put in the floor, so they call for an alternate."And they ask in the event they can get a lower bid for the hardened surface than for the asphalt tile whether we would insist on it. We say no because plain concrete floor is not an average floor, and so we would recommend in that particular case that they take the basaltic type of floor.

So these are the general things we review. It is a difficult process because as construction goes on naturally orders begin to appear and there are changes made. So it goes the rounds. So that is just one of the things we attempt to watch.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That answers the question I put. Now, you had something further you wanted to say?

MR. JAQUETH: Well, I don't know whether I should present this or not, but I think perhaps I should on behalf of the State Allocation Board and for the interest of your committee.

This is concerning the use of stock plans, portable units and so forth.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: For the record, I would like to say really that report which we do want to make a part of the record is more the reuse of plans, than it is the so-called stock plan.

MR. JAQUETH: Yes. We feelthat it would be to very great advantage and there is no question but what it is a very great advantage to a school district if it uses and if it can use a set of plans which has been previously prepared. We honestly feel that would be a very great advantage to a school district, but let's look at the record as to how that might work, that if we have a set of plans which has been used even in our own district, that we take, as Mr. Peterson explained this morning here, we take the original tracing and we make another print of it. Perhaps we erase off the name John Tyler School, which he mentioned this morning and we put on it LeRoy Land school, and we say, "Now, Mr. Contractor, we would like to have you build this school, the new school." It is all right if you can do it.

But so many times it does require even if you have just moved from one location several blocks over to another location, the slope of the ground may be the same, your sewer connections out in the street may be the same exactly, might be out in front the same way, your water connections might be just the same, and your electrical wires might come in from the same way. The sun might be coming from the same way, and the ground upon which you build the buildings might be exactly the same. Perhaps in that particular case you could use it.

More often, however, those conditions do not exist and it may be that when you move over to the new site, you are not going to house the same kind of pupils. They might be seventh and eighth grade or one or more classes of those, whereas over in the old site there was only elementary to the sixth grade. It requires somewhat different plumbing facilities and that type of thing.

So if duplicate plans can be used, we feelthat it is an excellent idea. One or two members of our Allocations Board have suggested that we stock pile some plans and some specifications and we open it up to invitation for schools to come in and look over these plans and as a matter of fact we have had school districts come in now and go over the plans. We have prints of all the plans that have been approved and we feel it is good business for the schools to come in and do it. However, we find that even Mr. Peterson this morning came in and I believe he told you that from a stock plan use he didn't believe it was a good idea, but they did use them as far as they could. I think that was generally about what he said and that in many cases they could use them to advantage over on another site. But we feel that the use of stock plans can be used, but there are differences in the mechanical devices of one school as compared to another. There is the difference in the plumbing facilities which are needed and there are differences in the soil conditions, of course, which change the foundation. There is a difference in just the fact that the time element works against the use of stock plans.

For instance, cement, concrete and mortar and that type of thing, paint, change from one time over to another. And the way that wood is manufactured and produced changes from one time to another, just like this being made in here. Three years ago, this woodwork would have been done in a different manner than it was done here, and so all of those things change and they must be taken into consideration. It must be written in the specifications as to what consideration is made concerning change of materials and supplies, changes in hardware, the different types of hardware that come along. So taking all those things into con-

sideration, we still believe that stock plans, if you have somebody on the job that can do all these things for the districts that are necessary to be done, it is a good thing to do.

Now, I think that your committee should look at the whole picture. It was presented to you that the plans were originally purchased by the district and then for a specific purpose. I am not trying to defend the architects, nor am I trying to defend stock plans. I am trying to present to you the problem and the picture as we see it. After the plan was once owned by the district, the district then revised those plans to fit the next case, and in the revision of the plans the district has an office force. Don't forget that. That maybe, they only pay the architect three and a half per cent for the second job on this particular project, but how about the office force ? Now, in Stockton they have an office force of the superintendent. They have five inspectors. They have a secretary and they have a draftsman. Those people are on salaries and their expenses go on all the time and should be charged to architecture. They are part of the architectural expense, so that is something for your committee to think about when you are talking about the cost of the architect.

MR. KEATING: I thought we had inspectors--

MR. JAQUETH: Inspectors are within the eight per cent charge in the architect's fee. I think that is a well acknolwedged charge.

MR. KEATING: Don't you have a separate inspector hired over and above the district?

MR. JAQUETH: They can tell you whether or not they do. As we understand it, whatever inspectors there are, sometimes they are employed by the district and sometimes they are employed by the architect, and

at any rate there is some expense.

Now, in the Los Angeles District we find the same thing, that in the Los Angeles City School District--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: They have a huge staff there.

MR. JAQUETH: They have an office force, so whatever their architecture cost is, why that is a fair charge. After all, they have it and it is a good thing for them to have it. Don't misunderstand me.

The City of Sacramento, they have no particular architectural force themselves, but they turn their work over. They have a superintendent architect. He then in turn passes the work around from one architect this time to another, and so on, and it revolves around among the architects of Sacramento.

In Stockton they haven't any particular architect. They trade with them all. It is just a point your group should keep in mind as you talk about the cost of architecture on the duplicate plans. So the duplicate plan idea needs somebody in the school office or somewhere n o matter where he is. He must be connected with the construction program, to watch those details for the district as they go along. And he is part of the expense.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Yes, in that very connection I asked the question of Mr. Glantz concerning the advisability or the practicality of having some such expert consultant in a county office who could work with those smaller districts who obviously can't afford what the Stockton District or the Los Angeles or the Sacramento Districts have been providing.

MR. JAQUETH: That is what prompted me to mention this to you now.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate your tying that in.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I would like to ask a question to tie in with the statement Mr. Jaqueth made. I believe you said in some of the school districts they make a rotation of architects. This job goes toArchitect A, and next time to Architect B and continues around until it gets back to Architect A again.

MR. JAQUETH: I don't know whether they take it A, B, C, D, but they distribute it.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Then, there is no competition between architects? It is just a case of you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours and you take this job at this place and next time you take the next job. There is nothing competitive about it. There is no competition between the architects as far as competing for those particular jobs as we do, say for open bids for contractors?

MR. JAQUETH: Well, I don't imagine that there is. I think the competition among architects is the competition of ability. It is a competition of design rather than it is or personalities themselves. I don't know how they pass that around, Mr. Collier, but I suspect if they do A, C, B and D, and I suspect even Stockton, they may have a tendency to favor some architect they know does them the best job, and if they can get out of it, they don't employ architect X because they don't think he is too good. So I don't know about that. I have never asked them.

MR. KEATING: I don't think it is a strictly rotating proposition. I think the supervising architect of the school administrators makes some decision as to who the subarchitect would be.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I was taking what Mr. Jaqueth said.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I think the best point to be drawn from

that, Mr. Collier, is that where they have a number of projects in any given district, a large district, it does have a number of projects more or less concurrently, rather than waiting for one architect over a year's time perhaps to draw the plans for each of those projects, they farm it out to a number of architects so they can get all those plans back and get rolling much faster.

MR. JAQUETH: That is one reason for it. But, even on the others where they are doing one or so at a time, they move them around. That is the public spirit. Really that is what it is.

I had only one other thing. I don't believe you gentlemen - maybe one or two of you - are familiar or aware that the State Allocation Board has had application for portable buildings. There have not been very many of them, but the cost of them is five dollars and eighty-two cents a square foot. Norwalk is one. But, the usual average cost is somewhere six to seven dollars on those things, and there is a very favorable bid there at Norwalk, and I think that is about comparable to the others.

But, here again on portable or temporary type of buildings, it is a question of design. You have seen the San Diego type of buildings, which is merely a shell with some kind of sunshade over the windows and over the doorway and a little stoop about as wide as this table for a walk; whereas some of the others like the Sacramento one, has somewhat of a little porch and it is enclosed partially. So there again it depends upon construction and what is included. The Sacramento one is one that you can take the class rooms apart and move them around, and the others are separate boxes by themselves. So those things,once again it is a

question of design for the particular building that they are making, but I think the feeling is beginning to come that for the swollen, the over-populated student population, if that is the way to put it, that if the natural population of a school is for ten class rooms in a given area, and they have excess population up to the equivalent of twelve or fouteen class rooms, that the school district then put on two or three extra portables or temporary, rather than build two or three extra permanent type of class rooms, and many of them have been asking about that and many of them want to do that, and they are beginning to find out now they can make that type of application to the Allocation Board and go along with that type of program.

MR. KEATING: Mr. Jaqueth, have you ascertained the live of the so-called portable class rooms in the Sacramento School area, what the life of them is?

MR. JAQUETH: Those that have just been recently built in the last year or two - we have no way of ascertaining the life of them. We do have a way of ascertaining the life of those built during World War I. Some of them are still out there being used.

MR. KEATING: How many years ago was that?

MR. JAQUETH: That was 1917 when they were built.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: You have some temporary buildings that have been out there thirty years?

MR. KEATING: They were not really temporary.

MR. JAQUETH: I think they were called that when they moved them out there.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I think the word "temporary" has been used.

MR. JAQUETH: They may be temporary as related to the buildings they are near, maybe the reinforced concrete or the stucco building on concrete foundations. The bottoms of a few of these have a few termites so they are not as longlived. We know that.

MR. KEATING: I would like to correct something Mr. Jaqueth said. I think Mr. Peterson this morning spoke of the repetitive plans he is using where it covered k to 6 grades only, so the repetitive plans in wings of five class rooms per wing, and two kindergartens, multi-use, administration and two units of the toilets were used where they needed fifteen class rooms or ten class rooms or no kindergartens. You know it was very flexible as to how you would use it. I don't think he had the 7th and 8th grades in this repetitive plans, Mr. Jaqueth, when he spoke about it this morning. That was going into the junior high level.

MR. JAQUETH: I dind't realize that I said anything about what he used them for.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I don't think there was any direct conflict in what Dr. Peterson and Mr. Jaqueth have said. However, I would liketo observe though that I think what Mr. Jaqueth has said with respect to the difficulties of sewer line connections, utility connections, soil differences and so on - it is still not anything like an insurmountable obstacle to the reuse of a basic set of plans. In other words, you will naturally have to make changes in your drawings for your foundation or for your utilities connections, but as far as the number of sheets that go in a total set of plans, it may be relatively small. So that even though you have a different topography, different access and so on, that is no major obstacle to the effective reuse of most of the basic set of plans.

MR. JAQUETH: I didn't want to infer, Mr. Lyon, that it was. I merely wanted to point out those were items that needed to be considered and those are the items that the school district usually depends upon the architect to solve for the district.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We recognize that and appreciate your pointing it out, but I did want to modify what was more or less the impression that you might have given. Thank you very very much, Mr. Jaqueth. Your testimony has been extremely helpful and very enlightening. I would like to ask Mr. Hanley to come forward at this time. Mr. Robert Hanley, Executive Secretary of the California Federation of Farm Bureau.

MR. HANLEY: I haven't quite gotten there yet, LeRoy. I am legislative representative, succeeding Mr. Fillerup. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I can't help but make one little observation in listening to the testimony here about temporary buildings and things of that sort. I understand the French have a saying thereis nothing as permanent as temporary, and that probably appliss in this case. I have a prepared statement here which isn't too long, and which I would like to present to you.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You may read it.

MR. HANLEY: I would with your permission, Mr. Chairman, like to digress for just a moment because of some comments that were made this morning by Mr. Nissen, the school trustee from Williams, which I think are pertinent in this respect that one remark that he made was in relation to his very definite impression there was a legal requirement that the architectural fee is eight per cent, and the other was they had the

feeling they sort of might be being led around by the nose by administrators and officials from the Division of School Planning and architects.

And I have noticed in my travels, particular, of course, in the rural areas, and from my personal experience as a school trustee, too, that it is simply amazing the amount of ignorance and misinformation that exists among school board members, and I think that is why a great deal of our problems arise.

When you have a lay board when a school district wants to build a school, to whom do they turn for advice? If they have an administrator, they turn to him, and if not, they turn to the superintendent, and from there the school planning and then the architect, and in defense of school board members, not that any accusations have been made here this morning, but on numerous occasions there have been comments made that trustees have wanted to erect permanent monuments in their honor and so forth and so on, and no doubt such things have occurred, but in their defense, I will say that I think a good deal of it results from misinformation and from lack of information, and if anyone has tried, as you have undoubtedly to analyze from a lay standpoint the Education Code, you can certainly be lost just as Alice-in-Wonderland.

"As you will recall, I was given the opportunity at previous hearings of this subcommittee to present the views of our organization onthe subject under consideration." I will digress for a moment . You recall we have supported for some time the use of standard plans or stock plans or as they have been tabbed reuse plans, and we believe very sincerely that the idea has a great deal of merit and could afford substantial savings. We were also granted the courtesy of introducing to you some of our

Farm Bureau people who were school trustees in their district and who had experiences involving school house construction, both state- aided and locally financed. (Mr. Hanley then proceeded to read his statement verbatim beginning with the last sentence of the second paragraph on page one to and including point No. 4 on the sheet attached to his statement, whereupon Mr. Lyon asked a question as follows.)

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: May I break in and ask, Mr. Hanley, if that is what's been pyramiding the bond repayment cost? We had testimony in January from Santa Clara County that indicated this on and off again and on again situation had pyramided them from forty cent legal maximum up to around _____cents per hundred.

MR. HANLEY: I believe that is the problem that is involved here. (Mr. Hanley then proceeded to read the section entitled "Findings", at the end of which he added the following comment.) I don't know if this subject has come before you, but apparently it is one that has concerned some of our people in some of our districts. No doubt, it merits study and consideration.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thank you very much, Mr. Hanley. I would like to ask one question. Did your committee and the house of delegates have any specific definition of what they thought a temporary school class room is?

MR. HANLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, nothing specific. They did discuss at some length the use of the portable buildings as they have been used in Sacramento and San Diego. Our primary interest, however, I think, from the standpoint of rural schools and the outlying districts is the use of duplicate plans as Mr. Nissen said this morning and pointed out.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You would like to have basic plans available, units of which could be reused in those areas?

MR. HANLEY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, now, let me- I am really disturbed over this resolution because I feel that it indicates a lack of understanding as to what the so-called temporary really is. In the first place, these portable units that the committee and I have seen in various districts are anything but temporary. They are permanent class rooms, but they are movable. They really should be called movable permanent class rooms because in the instance in San Diego, the interior is just as fine in every respect as their so-called permanent class rooms, and in personal investigation there, I found that when the teachers were given the choice of moving into the so-called permanent portion of the campus or staying in the so-called movable portion of the campus, they preferred to stay in the movable rooms. They felt they were equally good, if not superior, in some respects, although fromthe outside, admittedly they would need some dressing up to be permanently adapted to a site.

The same was true in the Los Angeles situation, Their architectural plan for the movable class room was identical to the architectural plan for the interior of the permanent with the exception that in the movable they used a vinylite type of flooring instead of the individual tile block, asphalt tile block, and they were using a little different grade of comb plywood interior wall finish, I believe, or different painting, but essentially the same architectural plan with a small additional cost made almost an identical permanent room once it was put down on a concrete foundation,

instead of the mud sill so-called upon which it was temporarily located. Now, it was temporarily located, but it was not in any sense of the word a temporary class room. It had just the same life length potentiality as a so-called permanent room in the permanent portion of thesite. I wanted to make that clear because I feel that there is no such thing under construction, at least on the state aided program, as a temporary class room. They are all permanent rooms, some of which are for convenience' sake a little more rectangular than they are square, and therefore movable from one site to another.

MR. HANLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would interpret the resolution and the thinking of our members as applying more to the temporary rather than the permanent portable. Now, I don't know if the Allocations Board is making the space computation apply against these portable class rooms or what action they took in the Norwalk district.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: By all means these portable class rooms, it is my understanding, isn't it true, Mr. Jaqueth, that the square footage in these portables or movables is counted in the total space in the district?

MR. JAQUETH: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It is not a temporary room. It is a movable room that can eventually be permanently located without any disadvantage to the students in the district.

MR. HANLEY: It isn't logical to assume it should be otherwise.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: So far as I know there isn't any such thing as a temporary class room being presently constructed that doesn't have a thoroughly permanent capacity in the sense that it is equivalent in

structure.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Some of the schools have temporary buildings that aren't movable.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That would have to be a locally financed program.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: The question arises there, should that district become eligible for State aid whether they should compute temporary buildings that are really temporary. For instance some of these school districts have leased former army barracks and they are temporary. They can't be moved. Now, should that district become eligible for State aid, I think it is your feeling that those temporary buildings should not be computed?

MR. HANLEY: That is part of the problem, and it is a question of interpretation and determination of what type of building it is, whether it is a tempoary or whether it is a portable that is convertible to permanent.

MR. KEATING: I might add to this, Mr. Hanley, if I may, that those army barracks that Mrs. Donahoe is talking about are unsafe under the Field Act and therefore they haven't been counted in this square foot area allowed to school districts on the ADA projection of enrollment. So if that is the kind of portables you are referring to, I think there is no problem about counting the square foot area on those buildings, but these buildings that are built by Stockton, who were here this morning, Sacramento, San Diego and Los Angeles and other school districts throughout California, they are adequate and they have a life from various information I have received of from twenty-five to thirty years, and some of them

have been in existence longer than that, and they are still safe and they are still educationally adequate and the people are apparently well satisfied with them.

MR. HANLEY: I think the entire intent here is applying to districts that have not come under State aid but who have found it to their best interests to met a sudden situation to go into a temporary portable facility and they want to avoid being put into a position where that is going to act to their discredit later if they have to come into a State aid program on a permanent basis.

MR. KEATING: If they build one now under the jurisdiction of the Division of Architecture for any kind of construction like that, they will have to be structurally safe under the Field Act, and therefore, unless they are substandard in construction, they would have to be considered as square foot area against the student enrollment.

MR. HANLEY: I gather that there are at the present time - there is ample protection for districts, as you have seen it in your own district.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: Mr. Chairman I would like to make this observation, that in viewing the Los Angeles temporary program --

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You mean the portable program?

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: Well, portable and what appear to me temp orary and quite temporary, and I followed it up with the Los Angeles school board about these facilities, and challenged their adequacy in construction. Now, the only thing similar that I say in one or two of those structures was the dimensions. I think the dimensions were about equal, but otherwise I don't think they had much similarity, and certainly they appeared to me very temporary and inadequate. The

school board, however, said that when these buildings were rehabilitated to a point where they expected to go that I would find that they were okeh, but, of course, that means more money being spent, too. So I just want to tread along with a little caution about some of these facilities being high class or acceptable on the basis on which we saw some of them.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thank you very much, Mr. Kilpatrick. One further question with respect to what Mr. Keating raised. Mr. Finch, would a quonset hut qualify under the Field Act?

MR. FINCH: It could.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I mean, would it, a quonset hut as a specific item.

MR. FINCH: A quonset hut has to be investigated to see that it will stand up under lateral forces. That is the essential requirement. Now, there are a lot of quonset huts that do qualify under the Field Act.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The reason I ask that is, and Mr. Jaqueth can answer this part of it, perhaps, I would like to know whether or not a quonset area as it is being used and has been used as a temporary proposition which has almost become permanent in some districts I personally know of is calculated against them on the square footage figures when it comes to applying for a State aid project in that district.

MR. JAQUETH: I think they could be called adequate if they were used for class room purposes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI: Would they be considered just temporary?

MR. JAQUETH: Well, naturally they are temporary if they are using them - perhaps they were built for a bus garage and because of over-

crowded situations they now have class rooms in them and as far as recordation is concerned they are not called class rooms.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: They wouldn't be counted against the district then?

MR. JAQUETH: No. The determinatiin is not made entirely upon whether or not the building meets the requirements of the Field Act.

ASSEMGLYMAN LYON: No, the educational adequacy. Your barracks and quonset huts which are the only truly temporary type that we have had brought to our attention probably are not counted against a district in the computation of square foot allocation.

MR. HANLEY: Another thing, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that was in the minds of our people when they discussed this was not to become involved in a situation that would tend to discourage districts from the use of this type of building when they had an emergency.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I think that is sound. Thank you very much for your contribution. If there are no questions from the committee are there any others here who wish to testify or who have any observations to make? Would you come forward and state your name for the record? Have a seat, sir.

MR. ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Lyon and members of the committee, I am Fred Robinson, District Superintendent of the North Sacramento School District.

We are immediately to the north and have about five thousand youngsters, nine plants, and we had four projects under Chapter 1575, seven projects under 1389 and we have not qualified under Chapter 19. I would like to make a few observations. I appreciate it is four o'clock.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is all right. We usually expect to be here later than that.

MR. ROBINSON: Thank you. I will make it as brief as I can. I would like to make one suggestion that actually I don't believe the committee needs to worry to much if you want to leave control in the local hands if the local hands has courage because we had an architect who was unsatisfactory. Cracks appeared in the gym. We released the architect and hired another one.

About that time we began our state aided project and when it was said that there were fifty-five square feet that we would be able to build - but money wasn't the main question right away. What is the adequate school plan was the question. Our instruction to the architect was this. We don't always expect,and so it has turned out, to have state aid. We expect to have to spend our own money, and so our instruction was, let's keep everything in the same tenor. If we are going to have monuments with state aided money, then we would have to have the monuments with our own money at a later date or we would be embarrassed.

So I would be happy to invite you individually or as a group to visit our North Sacramento school projects. I am proud of them and I feel they are a conscientious job well done by both the school board and the architect.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Could you advise us roughly what the per square foot cost was of those elementary projects?

MR. ROBINSON: I can't advise you at the moment. I am sorry I didn't come prepared, havingheard only this morning the committee was meeting, but I can say this and would like to get it in the record, even,

that we were the first, I believe, in the area here to build permanent portables, having preceded Sacramento who stole the glory both in our architect and our school board here. We have already moved them once and we had four of them. That was the first project under chapter 1389. I think Mr. Jaqueth could give the date better than I. We have found them rather satisfactory. It is true that as you move them down the street they rack a little bit and some damage is done, but the exterior was redwood nailed with galvanized nails rather than puttied nails. Therefore you just had to drive them back and hope they held all right. If you used putty or stucco you couldn't do that.

And as I say, we have already moved them once and I expect might move them again soon, since we are a growing fluctuating area and need such a facility in our district.

I would like to make one other observation concerning repeating plans. Our first multipurpose room had a skylight of aluminum and there were only two companies that furnished it. We tried one and then when the second structure was to be constructed we were fearful of having the second one the same and I am glad we didn't repeat that particular design because it hasn't proven satisfactory, and so I would suggest the plans need to be changed from time to time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Who suggested that type of skylight in the first instance?

MR. ROBINSON: It was suggested in the first instance for one reason because--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I mean by the architect, the Board, administrator, or office of school planning?

MR. ROBINSON: I believe it was by the architect and one of the reasons given was that during this war period glass is one of the dangerous things, although glass is necessary if you wish to use natural light. The less glass the better. So this skylight protected by the aluminum appeared to give us what we perhaps would desire, but it hasn't been as satisfactory as we would desire, particularly in its operation. And so we haven't continued. We have gone back to the clear window situation in an all purpose room.

MR. KEATING: That is a minor adjustment though on it.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It wouldn't take a new set of plans to eliminate a skylight.

MR. ROBINSON: That is true.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: That is where an architect from the office could give the kind of advice in adapting things to specific areas.

MR. ROBINSON: It is true that that could be done. However, I would like to suggest that a good architect oftentimes is way ahead of most everyone else in offering good ideas.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: In the planning, I mean to get it to an architectural stage someone who knew construction engineering is sometimes needed in the school.

MR. ROBINSON: I would like to make one other observation. I don't know how many of you were in Sacramento when the vicious wind blew the other day. I happened to be coming back from the superintendents' convention and told my wife I was very happy I wasn't home. I speak of this in support of what Mr. Jaqueth said, you are getting what you pay for

because in our larger sites covering eight acres where the school buildings and the landscaping adjacent immediately to the building covers about twenty-five per cent of the site, we have a situation where the north wind blows dust rather viciously and having come from Los Angeles and having seen that all the playgrounds are completely paved with black top, why I rather wondered if that might not be the wonderful answer, but we are state aided. We are also rather impoverished.

We are not able to do all that we would like to do and if you figure out what it would take to cover the balance of that playground with black top at ten cents a square foot, you will come to around twenty-five thousand dollars, which to me is a lot of money. And so I would suggest that such things as site development are very expensive items in a school program if you desire them.

Now, of course, the ideal situation is to have some turf, some black top and actually some dirt. We have mostly just dirt, and the wind did blow it around. I had an irate group of citizens at the next board meeting and they called me a bad neighbor and wanted me to immediately get rid of a public nuisance.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What would a lawn cost by comparison to black top?

MR. ROBINSON: We had a similar school area,not this one I speak of, but approximately the same in size and we secured figures and again it was a matter of getting a deep well and a pump and all and the nursery company that originally estimated it said ten thousand dollars for planting, and installing that, and then there is maintenance on top of that. So we stopped right there. We didn't do anything more, I assure you on that

matter.

I would like to make this observation that our relationship with the Department of School House Planning has been most excellent. They have been most helpful to us in our work.

I would also like to say that our relationship with the Department of Finance has been most excellent, too, but that brings me to my main complaint, which I would like to get on the record today, and that is it is not possible, as I see it, to provide an adequate school under the fifty-five square foot rule, at least in the elementary school where the fifty-five square foot rule applies, and well, it just isn't possible.

And the reason is this - it would be necessary, Mr. Lyon to have you come out and look at our system and judge whether we have anything in excess of what you would consider to be a good school.

I would say this, that I do not believe that a multipurpose room is a luxury. I have heard some people call a multipurporse room a luxury. We have provided the multipurpose rooms in our school plants. We only have nine school plants, two being rather small, the rest being really large schools, and a couple of them far too large, so that we have a multipurpose room in those larger plants, but when we got done with our square foot count, considering the number of youngsters,we have about one foot left over for the administrative quarters, and so my embarrassment is that I am in a condemned school building, which according to my agreement with the state, I should sell and move my library which needs five thousand square feet out into the street perhaps, and also the twenty-five people who work in the old school building, which actually has a measurement of some twenty-five thousand square feet.

And so our architect and the Board and myself have labored long and hard to see how we might provide administrative quarters which obviously are necessary to the operation of any school system, and I think we are going to solve our problem by the blessing of a little federal money solving our problem, but under the State program I wanted to protest that the fifty-five square feet is not enough to do an adequate job. That is my complaint.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is very remarkable, Mr. Robinson, because we have seen a lot of schools and there are dozens of sites that have been built in Los Angeles County with school plants not including movable, but just permanent buildings, where they are doing it consistently on their own money with a fine multipurpose room and everything else, well under the fifty-five square foot figure per student. I just can't conceive of the difficulty you mention because school after school is doing a beautiful job at the fifty-five square feet per elementary child, including the multipurpose room with their kitchen facilities and everything. That is amazing to me. I can't imagine why you are having that kind of difficulty.

MR. ROBINSON: That is my difficulty at the moment.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You are unique in it as far as I have heard before a committee or otherwise. Mr. Keating, you have a question.

MR. KEATING: What grade level do you have?

MR. ROBINSON: Kindergarten through six.

MR. KEATING: It only takes a half of fifty-five to house a child in a classroom.

MR. ROBINSON: But, each of my principals complains he hasn't

storage rooms enough with that much space, and the janitors raise the same complaint, and yet I would say normally speaking our schools are very nice, but at the moment I am embarrassed because we haven't been able to squeeze in under the state program administrative quarters, so Mr. Jaqueth is asking me when I will sell this old school building to live up to my agreement and I find myself unable to provide adequate quarters for myself and administrative staff and library and warehouse.

MR. KEATING: Your new application to the state will include that old building?

MR. ROBINSON: I have to get rid of it before I can reapply. We have not been in a position to apply under the provisions of Chapter 19, or I would be living in a tent.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: Would it be feasible for the committee or any part of the committee to visit the area say this evening say at eight or nine o'clock?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, it might be. I doubt if the administrator and the janitor and the staff will all be there after dark, and some of the committee members would not.

We were planning, Mr. Kilpatrick a tour of a number of Sacramento schools tomorrow afternoon. We hadn't known about Mr. Robinson's invitation. We were primarily going to inspect the Sacramento movable units before they were moved and at some locations after they were moved and also we are going to inspect a couple of schools built on state aid and since have been annexed into Sacramento Unified District upon which are movables, which will give a contrast between state aid and locally financed buildings. If we can work it in,in the time allotted, we might well drop by,

Mr. Robinson. We will find out the address and give you a call if it is possible for us to visit your schools. I would like to see what there is about your situation that is so crowded.

MR. ROBINSON: Having bragged on my architect, I would like to introduce him. He is Mr. Koblik. He would also help you understand all the technical details.

MR. KEATING: Mr. Koblik can't design a school for you under fifty-five square feet?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, he can, but when we completed our project we found ourselves without adequate administrative quarters.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: In our tour of the Los Angeles City School buildings in February, at least it was noted by the chairman of the sub-committee that they had very spacious administrative and nursing room and doctor's room facilities all included with the multipurpose room in their fifty-five feet or less per student. That is why, in fact, I thought it was entirely too adequate as a minimum program.

MR. GLANTZ: That is the individual school. He is speaking of a district administrative office.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I see.

MR. ROBINSON: I am speaking of the district. In other words, we have the nine plants. The schools are nice, but I have a staff of people, supervisors and libraries and clerical staff.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: That is away from the campus of those schools?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is not on any one of those sites?

MR. ROBINSON: But it is needed whether it is on the school site

or not, but the principal has an office and there is a nurse's room in each school.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: If you divided that down, you might be one room off.

MR. ROBINSON: But, you can't do it and house all the children, that is my statement.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thanks very much, Mr. Robinson. Mr. Koblik, did you have a word?

MR. KOBLIK: Just to clarify this point on the fifty-five square feet. Mr. Robinson has only K-6 children. His 7th and 8th grade children are being educated by the Grant Union High School Board. Therefore he doesn't get that seventy-five square feet on those children and that is what is causing the hardship in his particular case. If he had K-8, he would pick up the additional space, but he doesn't have those children and that is the particular bind in this case.

MR. KEATING: May I ask a question, Mr. Koblik. Is is possible this school has built a school plant under the state aided program where they have utilized all the square foot are a on those plants without allowing or holding back some school area for administrative purposes?

MR. KOBLIK: Naturally, the district was making every effort to get class rooms. They have been on double session for many many years. I imagine they are one of the first schools in California to be on double session. All through the years they have spent all of their area for class rooms and administration at the schools and not the central adminstration buildings.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What is your percentage in the individual

school plant between class room area and administrative area?

MR. KOBLIK: I don't think I could give you that, Mr. Lyon. I would like to clarify one point. When their seventh and eighth grade children were taken over by the high school district they used those class rooms for a K-6 school. Since it wasn't designed for K-6 - it had closed corridors, that particular plant is not an economical plant in square foot area for their K-6 students. That is one of the problems in this particular case.

MR. KEATING: It is no fault of the formula of fifty-five square feet per pupil.

MR. KOBLIK: If the Department of Education would reanalyze this particular seventh and eighth grade school and give them credit for these closed corridors, it may not. I don't say it would solve the problem entirely because they need about fourteen thousand square feet for their central administration buildings, which is now housed in this old school of twenty-four or twenty-eight thousand. They really don't need that area, but they do need a safe building for their centralized administration which they don't have at the present time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Koblik, this question perhaps isn't exactly appropriate or may indicate some ignorance, but does the Field Act apply the same to administrative personnel when they are quartered by themselves with no students in the building.

MR. KOBLIK: Well, if you put it that way the answer is no, but really it is yes because you can't have a central administration without having parents and teachers and pupils going into the building. For the maintenance staff where no children or teachers go into the buildings,

that does not come under the same rigid rules as this school building, but the central administration does come under the Field Act.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: May I ask Mr. Robinson a question? Mr. Robinson, how many schools do you have in your district?

MR. ROBINSON: Nine.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: What is your enrollment?

MR. ROBINSON: Our enrollment is forty-five hundred. Our ADA runs higher than that because of the contractual arrangement with the high school so that we collect the ADA and pay the tuition of the high school. If you look at the official record, you will see it is higher than that.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I have another question, to what extent did you make use of the, reuse of plans on the last eight plants?

MR. ROBINSON: We weren't able really to reuse plans.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Not at all?

MR. ROBINSON: No, I don't think so at all.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Somebody slipped. It looks to me like you had a beautiful opportunity to reuse plans.

MR. ROBINSON: We are talking about that at the moment with Mr. Koblik.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I think it is a good idea. Any further questions of anybody here or any further statements that people wish to make?

MR. GLANTZ: I would like to make one more observation that I brought this up before the committee last January, and that was that there is no provision in the present state aid program whereby a district that

has a very high tax rate for operative purposes plus a tax rate set on top of the operative tax rate to accumulate some help-yourselves money in the building or equipment field. For instance, we have a district in our county that has-one I'm thinking of that has a two dollars and forty cents tax rate. Fifty cents of that the board has set aside as capital outlay money.

The general recommendation is that a board or school district carry twenty per cent, I think it is, reserve in their budget, and any funds over and above that twenty cents, per cent rather, the Allocation Board may take away and put into the pot, into the building fund. Now that encourages a district that wants to keep its tax rate down and get all the state aid they possibly can. It even encourages them not to help themselves to any more extent than they have to, just enough to operate on.

While on the other hand the district that wants probably something a little better feels that rather than loading thirty-five youngsters in every class room, they want to limit it to twenty-eight. They think they can have a better educational program that way. They are willing to tax themselves extra for that to that extent and help themselves a little better, yet under the state aid program that money is taken away from them.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate the point you are making. It was found, however, in some cases that districts just went to the other extreme. They were saving that money away and coming to the state for the full bill for their school building in the new construction program, and they really were penalizing the other districts that weren't nearly as well of. That is why the restrictions were written in.

MR. GLANTZ: The effect of the act is that the district helps itself as little as possible up to the maximum that the state asks, ninety-five per cent of the assessed valuation. Beyond that point they don't have to help themselves.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, they do have to to some extent in repayment if they possibly can.

MR. GLANTZ: I think it would be well if it could be written into the code that any district that has a tax rate in excess of a certain amount for operation and its own capital outlay purposes, should not have that overage taken away from them.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That may be a good suggestion.

MR. GLANTZ: Maybe I like champagne instead of beer. It is my business if I want to buy it, and the local district can do the same thing.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Keating has a question.

MR. KEATING: Would your school district, for instance, on all eligible bond money make all of that available to the state?

MR. GLANTZ: Oh yes, they offered to do that.

MR. KEATING: You don't believe in their spending that bond money for anything else than matching state money?

MR. GLANTZ: That is right. The operative tax I am speaking of.

MR. KEATING: I am speaking of district bond money. You make that all available without exception to the building of class rooms?

MR. GLANTZ: Yes, I would recommend that, but not this two dollars and forty cents tax rate, fifty cents of which they are setting aside to help themselves with a few more things that probably Joe over here

can't get.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Jaqueth, do you have a comment to make on that?

MR. JAQUETH: Mr. Chairman, would you like to quit, or would you like to discuss this thing a bit longer. Maybe I could just offer a suggestion. The subject Mr. Glantz brings up is just one that is really very important and it is perhaps the underlying problem here connected with school construction. You are all familiar now with the five per cent limitation as far as bonds are concerned. You all are familiar with the demand that is placed on the school district to provide facilities, and you all are familiar with the improvements that are on the property that supply the funds with which to build those facilities. In other words, from the returns and limitations which the state has placed in the various acts there is not sufficient return to pay the bill. Consequently some additional funds such as state aid funds seem to be required, and so the whole thing goes back to not only for school purposes, but for assessments for improvement purposes, and for water districts and sewer districts and everything else, so that perhaps a study should be given toward a method which will provide funds for public purposes on some other basis or an elaboration or change of the present basis, for instance a two thirds vote is necessary, and you can have five per cent of the assessed valuation. And the assessed valuation, even though you do have very high class residential district, doesn't anywhere near provide the funds.

Now, it would seem perhaps there might be a more equitable way and one way I mentioned very briefly, lease purchase plan, which is one

way, and that is a loan basis, but there is a possibility, and it would seem - I know we are giving thought to a system, for instance, we will call it a variable assessment method, placing the amount of an assessment required to raise the funds that if you still want to raise the funds by means of assessment, would raise the amount of assessment income based on the need in a particular district. Now, that need is something that can be definitely determined.

The youngsters are there and the improvements upon which you would collect the money to pay for the improvement is there and so those are known things and starting from that it would be a very simple thing to work out a definition and a formula whereby the amount charged by the county, we will say, back through its assessment, would meet the demand and take away all of this school aid whereby the wealthier communities are paying the way for the poorer community.

I have been wanting to throw that out for an idea for perhaps consideration. Mr. Collier is very familiar with the equalization of assessments and this isn't talking about equalization assessments at all. It is merely talking about devising a formula whereby the district can raise at its own level through a formula the amount of money which it needs and in that particular case if the people in the district wanted a gold plated school, they could have it. There would be no question about it in anybody's mind except their own. They would be the one making the selection and it would be back on the same basis as it was previously where the people in the district are the ones that decide what they have, but it would be changing the method of actually collecting those funds. It is back in the old field of taxes and whether or not, how you raise those

taxes and the money referred from those taxes to pay the necessary bill, it is up to the district. But, it is something that could be worked out, I am sure.

Miss Donahoe was raising a question and it just seems worthy of explanation by the state tax people as well as by people like ourselves and others that are familiar with improvement district operations and improvement district costs. Those who are familiar with the operations of educational districts and educational district costs could sit down and work out what might be considered an equitable way of raising the money to pay the bill perhaps in a different way than the old 1850 manner of merely taxing property that is out here in acreage.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is certainly a very meaty problem to get our teeth into and I think it is something I know I want to give further study to.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: This question doesn't deal with this, but I wanted to ask, especially after Mr. Robinson's statement about multipurpose rooms. Is there any opportunity or chance of any leniency in the offing on the use of multipurpose rooms in the areas where a particular multipurpose room would be the only place that the whole community around it has for a meeting place of any kind? I mean, to write that off in the category of luxury is pretty stringent when there isn't any place else in this community where a meeting could even be held. Might there be any chance?

MR. JAQUETH: In other words, the school providing facilities for other public use?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Yes.

MR. JAQUETH: I don't know of any.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: For instance, this school in Indian Wells Valley actually when it came to graduation they had to move cars out of the garage and scrub the public garage floor to have graduation exercises because there isn't any place in that whole area where there is even a stage or anything.

MR. JAQUETH: Well, we are finding by this little survey that we are making that school districts, some of the school districts, are having a meeting every night twenty to twenty-two nights a month, which is practically every night out of the month and that every month of the year, for the purposes other than maybe the PTA because they would be included in the school. But, it is something other than the school activities, and so the schools are providing a facility there for other purposes than educational, so we find too that the actual use of the multipurpose rooms is for luncheons probably every noon, but not too much for the multipurpose use itself, and so those things are things I presume that the local boards of trustees have to adopt a policy on themselves, that if they are includable in a program, but as far as the actual wording of the act is concerned, we can't write them off and say we are going to forget this area you have here for multi-use purposes because it is included in the provisions of the act specifically. Your legislature could do that, but we administratively could not.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: On some of those there wouldn't be a question of even going out and renting a place for graduation or school purpose or play or for even the orchestra because there is no place to rent.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thank you very much, Mr. Jaqueth. If there are no further questions or no one else who wishes to testify, we will recess until nine thirty tomorrow morning in this same room.

(Thereupon the committee stood in recess until the next morning.)

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1954, 9:30 O'CLOCK, A. M.

---o0o---

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We will reconvene the meeting of the Assembly Interim Committee on Education Subcommittee on Public School Construction Costs. I think there is only one here who wasn't here yesterday, but for the benefit Mr. Dent from the Mount Diablo District on my far left is Assemblyman John L. E. Collier the Chairman of the full committee who is sitting with us. He is from Eagle Rock in Los Angeles area. Our Committee Secretary Miss Blanche Hanson is next. On my right is Mr. Fred Keating of the Legislative Auditor's office, and Assemblywoman Donahoe from Bakersfield area.

Now Mr. Dent, if you would come forward and begin your presentation, we shall appreciate it.

MR. DENT: I have prepared copies of my statement and I will elaborate on it. I should like to begin by saying that the district is very appreciative of the work of the Legislature and of the various departments with whom we have worked on this state aided building program. There have been minor exasperations and there have been differences of opinion between the school district and the state agencies, but on the whole we feel that the advantages of the program have far outweighed any of those minor differences.

As I have indicated here in the second paragraph, we are going to make some suggestions and those suggestions are made in the spirit of improving the operation of a very complex relationship which exists between the state on the one hand which has to safeguard the spending of the funds and the district on the other hand, which sometimes is very

jealous of its integrity and wishes to maintain its own autonomy. In order that you can understand something about the district in question I have given some information on this sheet.

Our district is in central Contra Costa County about twenty miles east of Berkeley. Prior to 1949 it consisted of twelve elementray districts and a union high school district. And there was a slow period of growth through the war years and in 1949 there was an election held to unify the district, which was successful. In July 1949 we opened business as a unified school district. At that time with an enrollment of sixty-four hundred children - that is a total enrollment in elementary and high school.

The growth since that time has been fantastic as it has been in many California communities so that the enrollment as shown on the sheet at the present time is seventeen hundred , rather seventeen thousand five hundred youngsters. In a period of five years we have increased over eleven thousand children.

There is still a great deal of building activity going on and it is almost impossible to make predictions as to what the growth will be in the next five or ten years, but we do know that just taking the children presently enrolled and the houses under construction that by 1963 we will have another ten thousand youngsters. We can see that. So that our anticipation is that actually in about ten years we will double again and have somewhere in the neighborhood of thirty-five thousand children in this district .

It is a geographic area of about one hundred fifty square miles. Concord is the only incorporated area, but there is a great deal of

unincorporated area with a lot of building going on. We got into the Chapter 1389 program immediately after we became unified and at that time as indicated on the sheet, we had eleven elementary schools with ninety-seven adequate classrooms and one high school with fifty-five classrooms.

Since then we have been building just as fast as we can process these things, some with our own money, some with state aid money, some with federal grants, and at the present time in October of 1954, we have doubled our number of schools. We now have twenty-two elementary schools and two high schools with the number of classrooms as shown on the sheet.

Under Chapter 19 we now have under construction five additional elementary schools plus applications to several others, and with our own bond funds we are constructing a third high school.

So that a year hence, in the fall of '55 we will have twenty-seven elementary schools and three high schools with the number of classrooms you see there. So we are one of the larger districts in the state that has participated in the state aid program and I appreciate very much the opportunity of appearing before you.

As shown at the very bottom of the first sheet, we shall have spent by the end of this present year in local bonds six million one hundred fifty thousand dollars, state aid about seven and a half million, and federal grants about two and a half million dollars.

Now, in spite of building as fast as we can, and we think we have made as good progress as any district in the state, we cannot gain on the matter of half day sessions. When we first started we broke ground

in the summer of 1950 and that fall we had thirty-seven hundred eight youngsters on double session, in some cases through the seventh grade, and we were bringing the kids in the eighth grade into the basement of the high school to avoid having them on double session. And we have been building, as I say, like mad ever since and this fall we have more children on double session than when we started the program.

However, by properly placing the schools and districting the youngsters, we have reduced the grade level on which there are double sessions. There are no youngsters on double session above the fourth grade and there are three of our schools with no double sessions at all. It becomes a matter of solving a problem here and one pops up over there. So we get all these youngsters off double session, and then we are working on this, and by that time these kids are back on double session in the third grade again.

This article appears in yesterday's paper in Contra Costa Gazette and it says that the enrollment still outstrips construction in Contra Costa County schools. And all of these districts are in the state aid building program and everyone of them have more children on double session this fall than they had last fall.

Now, I don't have any answer to that, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Keating and I were talking a little about it. There are certain things about this building program that we can't blame on state aid at all. There are just inherent slownesses in getting a program going. When a school board decides they want to put a school in that particular spot, we found it takes just about two years between the time they make that decision and the time we can actually move into the building, and by that time

other things have happened, so when we move into the building it is overcrowded. We had that situation happen to us in two schools where we thought we had plans pretty well made for a certain size school. When we actually moved into the school the kids were under double session through the third grade. We are now making additions, too, under Chapter 1389. I would like to say a word about our future needs, and I am sure that the material I am presenting this morning is not new to this group, but at least it tells the story as far as our district is concerned.

I am sure you have seen this type of chart before, but it is extremely significant. This is our enrollment by grades. As you see, it is listed on the mimeographed sheet. Now, of course, the big wave of youngsters is this year in the third grade. By 1957 they will pass through the sixth grade and by that time we hope we shall be able to take care of our kindergarten through sixth grade schools.

By 1959 we have them in the seventh and eighth grade schools. We do not have a junior high school. And by 1963 they will be through the high school. Of course, our great worry is about constructing facilities in these upper grades because we now have in these first four grades over eighty-two hundred youngsters, and we have in these four grades only three thousand youngsters (9 through 12).

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It shows the high school problem we are facing in the next few years.

MR. DENT: That is right, and it is a more expensive problem than building for these youngsters up in here. We have attempted to estimate what costs would be and there are so many unknowns that it is virtually impossible. No one could have foretold five years back what the growth

in our area would be. No one can foretell in the next five years what it is going to be. So all we have done in this part B. on the second page is take the youngsters that are actually in school and move them up through the grades and take the homes that are actually under construction. It doesn't include any possible additional subdivision developments.

We know that going beyond our present program in Chapter 19, we will still have to take care of this number of youngsters so here are thirteen hundred K-6 youngsters and we have found the cost is roughly eigh hundred dollars a child so we are going to have to spend about another million dollars at that level. In the seventh and eighth grade level there will be about fourteen hundred youngsters we will have to provide for when these kids get up into the seventh and eighth grades. And we found it costs about twelve hundred dollars to build and equip schools for that age group. So that gives us an estimated cost of one million six hundred eighty thousand dollars.

Of course, the big problem is up in the grades nine to twelve. There will be forty-five hundred youngsters we will have to care for and those schools run around eighteen hundred dollars per child. So it is something over eight million dollars will have to go into high schools, and a great deal of that will have to come from state aid.

Now, we have summarized that on a little chart here. This is essentially our 1389 program and this is Chapter 19 that is going on at the present time. In our program for 1949 to 1953 we spent about seven million dollars on K-6 schools. We spent a little over two million dollars on seventh and eighth grade schools, and we spent a little less than two million dollars on high schools. The same thing is true here.

The greater portion of this money that we are now working with is going into K-6 schools, a small amount into the seventh and eighth grades and a little over a million and a half into high schools. Now, this is the picture which I have just talked to you about at the bottom of this sheet.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: May I interrupt right here Mr. Chairman. You were giving the cost there per pupil in the elementary and then up through the seventh and eighth and then the ninth and twelfth. Would you say that that would be the comparable cost throughout the State of California for those particular grades for construction?

MR. DENT: I can't answer that, Mr. Collier, because I don't know. This is our own experience, our particular costs.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Yours have been low.

MR. DENT: The bids coming before the Allocation Board in recent months have been below eleven dollars a square foot and one of them ran nine dollars and eighty-three cents a square foot. That is on the elementary level. So I wouldn't know and I wouldn't want this to be accepted as a state-wide figure. It's been our experience.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: That is your experience in Contra Costa County?

MR. DENT: In Mount Diablo District, let's say.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Thank you.

MR. DENT: Well, this show graphically what's already been stated there and where our major worry is, where we are going to obtain this eight million dollars for high school construction. So much for background.

Now, we have in the last page some suggestions and we certainly don't know the answers to all these problems. We have already indicated our

concern over the time that it takes and I am sure that you people have the same concern. However, it's only fair to say that even when we are building with our own money, not being involved in the state program, that there are delays and you can almost build up a list of dates showing when the Board decided to do something and then there is the matter of acquiring a site, getting surveys, getting title searches, getting appraisals and so forth until you finally obtain the site and then there is the planning stage and the approvals by the Division of Architecture, which in some cases takes two or three months and in other cases where it is a repetition of a plan it has been cleared before that. It can be done rather soon.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: May I interrupt at this point. I see Mr. Finch from the Division of Architecture very vigorously shaking his head, Mr. Finch.

MR. DENT: I wouldn't want anyone to believe that that statement I made is true of all of our projects because it is not, but we did have a high school that was in there for a considerable length of time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: May Mr. Finch elaborate on that just now?

MR. FINCH: I can state as to Sacramento area, which is Area 2. Area 1 is San Francisco. Area 2 is our area. Area 3 is Los Angeles. In Area 2 a year ago we used to operate on the three weeks' schedule. That is, the plans were sent back for correction within three weeks of the time they appeared in our office. At the present time that schedule is cut down to about a week or ten days. Now, it is optional with the architect and school board where those plans may go in. If the time schedule is tight for them, I suggest they inquire around and send the plans

to the office where the office is in a position to handle them.

MR. DENT: May I ask Mr. Finch a question. Mr. Finch, do I understand if we had sent the plans for Ambrose High School, which is a million dollar project, that it would have beencleared in a week and a half?

MR. FINCH: No, a job that size may not have been cleared in a week and a half unless the project could be split up. We have handled jobs of that size in about two weeks or two weeks and a half, certainly within three weeks.

MR. DENT: We are interested in knowing that because it certainly has not been our experience in the San Francisco office.

MR. FINCH: Well, I am just outlining the facts in the case.

MR. DENT: Don't misunderstand me. I am not picking on the Division of Architecture.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It was my thought to get that point cleared up because Mr. Finch seemed to indicate three months was extreme.

MR. FINCH: I admit the time schedule is serious from an administrative point of view. Definite steps can be taken to insist that the plans be handled promptly. There is a certain time lag. The plans go into one office and it is assumed that the owner is willing to wait until they go out and maybe it takes as long as you indicate, and yet there are other offices that are in a situation to get the plans out promptly.

Now, if the time, as I say, if the time is important, why send them where they can be handled quickly.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Thank you very much, Mr. Finch, for that observation. It still remains that it took your school that time whether

it should or shouldn't have.

MR. DENT: That must be admitted that was a new job and it was a new design.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Finch, is it possible on a complete set of plans such as a brand new high school to submit portions, that is, a few sheets to one office and a few sheets to another office so they can be working on various portions?

MR. FINCH: No, it would not be practical to divide the plans among the offices because frequently details are shown onone sheet and the specifications are on certain groups. However, if it comes into our office and we see that the plans can be divided on that basis and the time schedule is tight, we divide it.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Among different personnel in the same office?

MR. FINCH: Oh, yes, as many as six. Of course, you appreciate that for efficiency of the man, it is better for one manto do the whole job, but if time is important, it is better to get the job out promptly, even though it does take say twenty or thirty per cent more time to handle it.

MR. KEATING: May I add something, Mr. Chairman. I think the Division of Architecture doesn't have the advance notice of how many plans are going to come into their office. So sometimes if they all come in at one time, why naturally it is going to delay some of those plans before they get worked on because they have limited staff over there to work on it.

MR. DENT: I think that is an excellent point, Mr. Keating, because right now, I would imagine,is a slack time. As soon as these districts

file their October 31 amendments, boom, then you are going to have a stack of work that high.

MR. FINCH: No, the picture I gave you is not a seasonal picture. It is the picture that's applied in our office anyway, for well over a year which takes the peak periods as well as the slack periods. Last fiscal year was the peak year in the history for our Division and in each of the three areas, too.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: You might have hit a time in the San Francisco office when there was illness.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Let me ask you this, Mr. Dent. What sort of follow up was made on that set of plans for the high school?

MR. DENT: The architect checked with the office about every ten days.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: They did. Sorry for interrupting you.

MR. DENT: I merely want to make the point that the Division of Architecture is one of many agencies, and we shouldn't put the finger on them particularly. At one time we made a little study and there were two different operations we had to go through in connection with--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I would like to introduce Assemblyman Geddes from the Fifth District, Napa.

MR. DENT: It is the cumulative effect of all these agencies that I think causes the time lag. Now, we have suggested here that perhaps some study should be given to the enrollment projection problem. We are pleased with the fact that the high schools are now permitted to project for three years instead of two. We are sure that will be of some help. The house count procedure was set up differently than it was in Chapter 1389

where we merely got statements from the subdividers and there may have been some abuses under Chapter 1389. We believe, however, that the present method is somewhat realistic in a rapidly expanding subdivision where we go out this week and we count so many homes and then if we were to go back thirty days later, we would be continually amending our application, which I presume we could do. But, again this is the sort of thing that happens. This is a clipping from the Oakland Tribune yesterday evening relative to a subdivision in our area. "Proposed nine million dollar development on the Wheeler Ranch on the east side of Walnut Creek has cleared its first major hurdle." Then it goes on to say that the map that was submitted calls for five hundred sixty-three lots on the one hundred seventy acre tract and that the initial project will consist of one hundred seventy-five homes, and I was told they are going to start this within thirty days. Of course, none of that is in the application which we are now submitting.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You can't count it in until they are laid out.

MR. DENT: That is right. We have a similar situation is a subdivision where there are going to be fifty-four homes. At the time we made our count two weeks ago, with a strict interpretation of the regulations we couldn't count any of them. So perhaps that is something that might be reviewed.

The second point, the priority system - I understand that there's been some revision or some modification in the way that the priority system works, but the procedure that was being followed some months ago was that the priority system was being used to actually limit in effect the number of applications that would be considered at any one

board meeting, and so we 'd say a dozen applications came in, then five of them were approved almost immediately, and then the sixth and seventh and eighth would remain dormant until such time as the priority system got down to certain points.

Now, we have been informed that that no longer is the case, that Senator Dilworth has discussed that with others and that perhaps this second point is not important, but we found last year under that policy that figuring priority points on the basis of percentage of unhoused children was to a disadvantage of a large district. The larger we got the smaller our percentage became even though we had the same number of children involved.

This next point, Point C is bothering us at the moment. As our district grows,and we now have a school system larger than that of the City of Berkeley, we have need for central administrative offices, warehouse space and so forth. Actually we are using a hodge podge. I am using a remodeled class room in the old high school building. One of my assistant superintendents is using a remodeled basement toilet room. We have our child welfare and attendance in one of the old abandoned buildings. We have our purchasing department over in the warehouse and so forth, and we feel the need of constructing some central administrative offices.

Now, it is true, of course, if we save out a certain amount of this fifty-five square feet and accumulate it, we will be able to build some central offices, but in doing so we feel we are depriving the children of classroom space or multi-use space or some other type of space. We suggest some study ought to be given to that. I don't think it is a problem

in a small district, but when you get up to sixteen, seventeen thousand children, then you can't operate without adequate central office facilities.

MR. KEATING: You are using a fifty-five square foot for elementary children, but I think you are operating from K through 12?

MR. DENT: That is right.

MR. KEATING: For seventh and eighth grades you are using seventy-five square feet?

MR. DENT: That is right.

MR. KEATING: And from ninth to twelfth you are using eighty square feet?

MR. DENT: That is correct.

MR. KEATING: So it isn't fifty-five square feet that you are using in your example three. That may be misleading in a sense.

MR. DENT: You are correct, Mr. Keating. The reason I put this in here, this has been discussed by a number of elementary districts such as Hayward and San Lorenzo that are getting up to nine or ten thousand kids, and, of course, they are limited.

MR. KEATING: You are not restricted to fifty-five square feet on your present enrollment.

MR. DENT: No, that is correct.

MR. KEATING: So that if the buildings that you designed and constructed were well planned a certain square footage could be saved to build up for an administration area and your administration area would take care of the entire district, is that true, sir?

MR. DENT: Yes, that is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: May I just ask this question, too, while we

are on it. Admittedly it must be inconvenient to have the situation which you just described. How much, in your opinion, does that injure the program of education, if it injures it in any way, of the district's children? The point I am getting at is even though it may be very very inconvenient for you and your staff, does it materially decrease the overall efficiency so that the children suffer?

MR. DENT: I don't think so, perhaps to a minor degree. Our problem is that we are continually growing so we have to get a new bookkeeping machine and a new bookkeeper and where are we going to put them?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate you have a problem there, of course the primary problem is getting class rooms for the kids.

MR. DENT: We have always felt that the class rooms were the most important.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: If we can ever get over the crest of this wave of growth, perhaps we would be in a better position to make a more favorable disposition of space for administrative office space?

MR. DENT: That is right. Item D is one that we are not yet involved in, but will be as these youngsters move on up through the grades. We are no longer going to be able to handle our high school building programs with our own finances, and when I am finished with my remarks I would like to yield the floor to Dr. Graham from Hayward who has made a definite study of this particular point, so I will pass this and let him discuss this matter of the square footage on the high school.

Item E, the matter of forty cent tax rate ceiling, which many of us misunderstood, I guess. At least I did. I got the impression somehow that

there was going to be a forty cent ceiling.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Most people do have that impression, I find.

MR. DENT: So that we thought paying off our local bonds and the state aid payment would not exceed forty cents and we told our people that. We were just misinformed. Actually it is working out in practice, you can see that we are paying on the Chapter 1389 bonds, interim bonds, and the Chapter 19 bonds, and the Chapter 1389 state-aid payment, a total of fifty-eight cents this year. We wish there were more consistency and there is no fault of the state particularly. I think this is a problem of the county and the county auditor in setting up his tax rates because, as we all know the state aid payment is related to last year's bond rates.

MR. KEATING: Mr. Dent is this correct, you have 1389 bonds at sixteen and eight tenths cents, and then the last item is 1389 state aid payment of twenty-five cents?

MR. DENT: Repayment to the state.

MR. KEATING: That is a repayment?

MR. DENT: That is right.

MR. KEATING: Both of those items are over forty-one cents, aren't they?

MR. DENT: The two put together, yes.

MR. KEATING: How is that?

MR. DENT: Because this twenty-five cents is related to last year's bond rate.

MR. KEATING: That is a repayment plan out of your maintenance and operation budget, is that right?

MR. DENT: That is correct. I listed them together here, Mr. Keating because I was trying to show we were actually paying, well it would be thirty-three cents on our bonds and twenty-five cents on our state aid repayment. What I was saying was that if there were some consistency it would make more sense perhaps. The first year we paid the state sixty thousand dollars. Last year we paid them nothing. This year we are paying them one hundred thirty-nine thousand. It just goes up and down and there is no consistency to it. I have conferred with people in the Department of Finance and I may have explained to my satisfaction how the thing works, and part of the problem is at the county level, not at the state level, but we see this thing as piling on and on above the forty cents additional burden.

Now whether there is any solution to that, I don't know. That would be a legislative problem, not ours, but I am merely calling attention to the fact as I am sure you have had it called to your attention by others.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Are you having any industrial growth in this particular area that will be high assessed value at a later date in your district?

MR. DENT: Unfortunately no. Our problem is it is going to Antioch and Pittsburg.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: And you are just the bedroom?

MR. DENT: And we are getting the people and the children. They don't particularly want to live in an industrial community so they come over and live with us and industries prefer to go over to Antioch and Pittsburg. So it is an aggravating problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Have you contemplated any steps in trying to reorganize your district whereby you can bring in some of that high assessed value into your district, maybe unification with your adjoining districts?

MR. DENT: I pointed that out in the beginning that we unified in 1949 and at that time that point that you make was an important one because the Associated Oil refinery had fifteen million dollars of assessed valuation and thirteen kids, so we did that at that time, but at the present time Pittsburg is a unified district and Antioch is a unified district of their own, so there is not much prospect of relief in that direction. We have a very high operating tax rate, instead of one dollar sixty-five cents usually in effect, we have three dollars as our operating tax rate because of the problem that you have mentioned.

The last point is a matter of administration and of interpretation perhaps. We are a little concerned sometimes. This is one of the minor irritations possibly, and in most cases we have been able to work out a satisfactory solution, but this limitation of five per cent of the construction cost to the site development sometimes works a hardship, and we have had some instances because of peculiar drainage and grading problems that the five per cent has been used up and therefore there has been practically nothing for playground space and then we have had to use the general fund to put in paved play areas.

I appreciate very much the chance to appear before you, Mr. Lyon, and I think that concludes pretty well my presentation.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I think we have some questions, Mr. Dent. I would like to break in at this point to introduce to you and the other new

people here, Assemblyman Frank Belotti of the First District. Northern California, Eureka, who just came in. Mr. Keating, you had a couple of questions, I believe.

MR. KEATING: Mr. Dent, you show on page two the upper part there under half day sessions as of October '54, five thousand three hundred eighty-seven pupils on double session. In further calculating that figure or cutting it in half, you would have approximately twenty-seven hundred unhoused children, correct?

MR. DENT: That is correct.

MR. KEATING: At thirty pupils per class room that would represent about ninety class rooms, is that correct?

MR. DENT: Yes.

MR. KEATING: That you would need?

MR. DENT: Yes.

MR. KEATING: Now, you present applications with the Allocation Board that have come in and have been approved and some have gone to bid which total about one hundred eleven class rooms?

MR. DENT: That is correct, so it is only fair to say that in the fall of '55 we will be in pretty good shape.

MR. KEATING: Not before then?

MR. DENT: No.

MR. KEATING: Will any of these construction projects be completed before the fall of '55?

MR. DENT: One three-room addition has been completed and one four room additional is almost ready.

MR. KEATING: Project 1 and 2?

MR. DENT: One is Gregory Gardens and 2 is Pleasant Hill. Our others are in various stages of construction. Project No. 10, three-room addition at Bay Point is completed, but the large ones, the five new schools, with a possible exception of one, will not be finished until next spring. Three of them, Mr. Keating, have just gone to bid. Two of them are before the Allocation Board as of last Tuesday.

MR. KEATING: I am talking about prior to the Allocation Board meeting Tuesday. I am talking about the last eight you had going to bid last August 31. That is the last tabulation I have made. Apparently you have in the Allocation Board approved applications for over one hundred class rooms. That will take care of your unhoused children at the moment.

MR. DENT: That is correct.

MR. KEATING: So if you can keep going with other applications that will be faster than your growth.

MR. DENT: Your point is well taken. If we can just keep going now we may catch up or come closer to catching up than we are at the present time.

MR. KEATING: Now, at the bottom of page two, sir, you have certain costs per pupil, on elementary, junior high and high. What do you figure is the cost per pupil? Is that the construction cost?

MR. DENT: No, this is the total budget.

MR. KEATING: The total budget including maintenance and operation expenses?

MR. DENT: no, I mean taking what the allocation Board approves for construction, surveys and plans, inspectors costs, furniture, the whole

works taking that total figure.

MR. KEATING: Yes, sir.

MR. DENT: It averages out about eight hundred dollars. That is not an accurate figures. It is an estimated figure. Of course, it will vary from one project to another.

MR. KEATING: This is a construction estimate only on per pupil, is that what you have said?

MR. DENT: If you mean by construction the contract cost only, no. If you mean by construction the budget including the contract cost, the architect fees and furniture, that is how that was obtained.

MR. KEATING: I see.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: Cost the school about nine dollarsa foot.

MR. DENT: We had one nine dollars and eighty-three cents a square foot. Several others recently have been running ten seventy-five. I think we have one coming up this next week at ten ninety-five.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: How much are you paying the architect there?

MR. DENT: Eight per cent for the original plan and seven and a quarter for re use.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Seven and a quarter for reuse? How much reuse really are you getting out of those sets of plans then? Are you using very many sheets without revision? That is not much of a reduction compared with other districts we have talked to.

MR. DENT: We agree and we are going to review the situation. Periodically we review as we complete a batch of the projects.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Let me make my question a little bit clearer.

Are you really transplanting fromone site to another virtually the same elementary plant?

MR. DENT: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: With only the changes necessary for site development, foundation changes utility connections and that sort of thing, but otherwise would they appear to be the same?

MR. DENT: I wouldn't say you could take this plan up and put it down over here. There are certain basic elements that are the same in both. We may have a type of multi-use room which we are going to build over here, but we have found, as I think in any home building that when you have built one there are some things you don't like about it and you want to make changes. We have made changes in our heating systems. We have made other modifications as we have gone along. Those have been incorporated in these so-called reuses. A new one where we pay the full eight per cent again is an entirely different type of design. This nine eighty-three school is entirely different from the others. It is a back to back arrangement with skylights up above, instead of the usual parallel series of wings.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Have you found that you saved very much on the contractors bidding on plans that have been used before? In other words, on your bid on a reuse do you find that they are bidding a little bit lower because they have had experience with that same set of plans before, or portions of it?

MR. DENT: I don't think I have an answer to that, Mr. Lyon. We have a number of contractors who continue to bid and our prices have been steadily going down. Now, whether that is the factor, I don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It could be one of them. It is hard to tell from what you have said whether that is true. Just for the record, I don't believe we established, are you the business manager or the superintendent?

MR. DENT: I am the superintendent of the schools.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You are the superintendent of the entire district?

MR. DENT: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Do you have a business manager for the district that coordinates the building program and works with the inspectors and the architect and so on?

MR. DENT: In our district I have two assistants, ones is the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction and personnel. He handles the every-day working of the instructional program. The other man is assistant superintendent in charge of business, and he handles purchasing, warehouse, transportation, cafeterias and the rest of it. I am the one who coordinates the building program.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You really take under yourself the coordination, management of the building program?

MR. DENT: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Working with the architect and so on?

MR. DENT: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Since you do have a large number of projects, do you attempt to farm them out to different architects or does one architectural office handle all of them?

MR. DENT: We have four firms working together as the associated architects, but they work as a group so that when we have, let's say, five

jobs to go out all of a sudden. The Board of Education works with the chairman of the group, who happens to be Jim Anderson. He then works with his group and we don't know or care particularly which office is working on that particular set of plans. It's worked out beautifully because the work load fluctuates in that group and they might have an office that can take on a couple of these, or they may pass it to one of the others.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That sounds like a very good approach. So, you haven't lost a lot of time by having your projects piled up in one office then?

MR. DENT: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: One question, or one point which you didn't fully develop, although you alluded to it, and that is the fact it takes about twenty-four months from the time the board makes a decision until you are able to move into your state aided plant. How long does it take for your locally financed project to go from the same board decision stage to the occupancy stage?

MR. DENT: I don't have the data so I would have to guess, but I imagine that we would save maybe three months, something like that.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I mean from the time the board decides a program until you actually move into the buildings.

MR. DENT: In the one case I used the figure of twenty-four months which is picked out of the air. It might be twenty-two months. What I am saying is with our own we would only save about three months.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You would only save eighteen or nineteen months as compared with the twenty-three months or twenty-two months?

MR. DENT: That is right. You see it varies quite a bit depending

on whether we can get the site itself. That may be a six months' delay. In one case we had to go to condemnation. That was a locally financed project, that had nothing to do with the state aid.

There are so many variables in there it is hard to give a hard and fast statement as to how many months it is going to take.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: If there are only three months difference on an average, you estimate, between the time it takes for a locally financed project and the state aided, you don't have too great a contrast there. It is not nearly as great as some other districts have indicated.

MR. DENT: Well, I don't know what the others have said and my data may not be very reliable. I haven't gone back to see how many months it has taken.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We do have statistics from the Santa Clara office and they had them detailed by twenty-three months, twenty-eight months, as much as thirty-three months in a number of cases in state aided, whereas the locally financed projects running from seven to eleven months, which was a very great contrast. You don't seem to have nearly that difference.

MR. DENT: No, of course, most of our building in recent years has been in State aid. The only one we built with our onw money has been a high school.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: So you don't have too much to make a comparison.

MR. DENT: And the high school got started in the middle of the winter. There were terrific delays on account of the rain. It took that particular high school almost as long as it takes these state aided projects.

but it was because of the weather in that case.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I would like to introduce Assemblyman Kilpatrick of Lynnwood. This is James Dent, the Superintendent of Mount Diablo Unified School District, K-12. Mr. Keating has one more question.

MR. KEATING: Mr. Dent, do you have, or could you give me the budget for '54-55 for your school year?

MR. DENT: Operating budget?

MR. KEATING: Yes, approximately.

MR. DENT: It is approximately five million dollars.

MR. KEATING: Five million. What is it going to be in the '55-'56 school year, the current year we are in now.

MR. DENT: I am not sure that the figure I just gave you was this year's or last year's. In round numbers it was around five million dollars and our enrollment went up a couple of thousand and I think that was last year's figure, and this year would be about five, six. Our cost per pupil is around three hundred dollars.

MR. KEATING: It goes from five million to five million six?

MR. DENT: Somewhere around that.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Mr. Dent, have you given any consideration or has your board given any consideration to the use of movable class rooms, not temporary class rooms, but portable permanents as they might be called, as some other districts in the state have done?

MR. DENT: We have talked about that topic, Mr. Lyon, on a number of occasions, most recently this last Tuesday evening. We are concerned, as I guess many districts are with what is going to happen when this wave

of kids passes on and a new group of people move into that neighborhood or the old timers stay there and they don't have children. Also there is the factor of cost and there is the factor of being able to shift them from one place to another, and there is the factor of speed with which they can be constructed. We have been so far behind that we haven't been able to get on most of these a complete setup. We have thought of augmenting after we have maybe sixteen classrooms on a site with a multi-use room and administration room, then augments that with these movable class rooms.

MR. KEATING: Mr. Dent, could I ask you a question? On certain projects that have been approved by the Allocation Board consisting of additions to existing plants, namely three, four, six, seven, eight class rooms additions to existing plants. Couldn't they have profitably been portable class rooms as Mr. Lyon has referred to.

MR. DENT: In what sense, Mr. Keating, from the standpoint of finance?

MR. KEATING: Well, finance, expediency of construction and portability in case the need for those classrooms and the plant you added them to may have reduced their enrollment, and you could have moved those class rooms to another site where the need was?

MR. DENT:I don't think I would say that in the case of those that are actually under way. It may be true in the ones that are coming up. We have got - that is one of the reasons it takes so long to figure this thing out as to where we are going to put these kids because this is another problem. As these kids move on up, we sometimes have to shift our boundaries back and forth and that might be a factor, too, where we are

building up a district here with too many permanent rooms. It might be better to put three or four of these movable class rooms on and then when we get a site over here and change this boundary line and some of these kids are coming over to this side, then we can take some of those movable class rooms, put them over here and add them to some permanent.

MR. KEATING: That is what I had in mind. If these were complete plants that you have added these additions to, if they were complete plants when you originally constructed them, these additions could have been portables to be used, or portable permanents as we call them, could be used for that purpose.

MR. DENT: They might have been.

MR. KEATING: I think you know what was done at Norwalk.

MR. DENT: I should like to visit the Norwalk district sometime.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We are going to visit a number of portable districts here in the Sacramento district this afternoon. Is Dr. Lawson here. He is the next one scheduled to testify. He is going to give us a background of their program. Are there other questions that members of the committee would like to ask Mr. Dent before we conclude his presentation and call on Mr. Lawson, Dr. Lawson? If not, we thank you very very much, Mr. Dent, for your presentation. It is very graphic. Dr. Lawson. I understand that there is also a Mr. McPherson of Napa who would like to make some comments. However, Dr. Lawson is scheduled first. If you would have a seat Dr. Lawson and for the record explain your title and full name?

DR. LAWSON: Deputy Superintendent of Sacramento City Unified School District.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Would you give a little background to the committee of the program of portable units in the Sacramento District?

DR. LAWSON: Yes. Briefly, Mr. Lyon, with the rapidly increasing and highly mobile population that we as well as many other communities have, our problem is how to keep our building flexible enough to meet the peak period of increase and as the same time not leave a monument of unused school buildings after the peak has been passed. And we think that we have pretty fair solution to this problem in our present policy of building a permanent elementary unit. We talke about the elementary particularly of from say twelve to sixteen rooms which in the new areas of residential growth will be needed for an indefinite period as far as we can see, and then to meet the peak period that we are beginning to face now and will face in the years immediately ahead. We are adding these portable permanent class rooms which are relatively, at least, of a permanent nature structurally, but are movable in type and character.

And these class rooms adequately can be moved from one place to another, to the place of greatest need, thus giving us a flexibility that we felt we have long needed in our school plant. Our philosophy in connection with this portable class room is briefly this, that we don't think t hese rooms are substitutes for the so-called basic and permanent school rooms or a school plant say, where we still need to build administrative wing, and nurse's wing and storage room and heating setup for what we think will be a permanent unit, or at least as far into the future as it is possible to see. But, these rooms are interchangeable class room units which can be added or subtracted according to the relatively temporary or unpredictable needs we will have in a given area.

We don't feel these rooms are substandard rooms in any respect. They are educationally adequate in every respect from the use we have put them to already. They are streamlined. They contain, we think, only the basic essentials. They are thirty-two by thirty in size. They are very spacious. We adequately seat from thirty to thirty-five pupils. They are wood constructinn or resawed redwood. They are set on twenty - four cement piers under each one designed to put them on skids for transportation purposes. You want a description of them.

The linleum tiled floors, acoustical ceilings, plywood walls, concentric lights, gas heaters, green board, tack board space, sinks, drinking fountains, steel sash, the ceiling is insulated with aluminum foil. They are built up - they have a built up aluminum cap sheet roof, and they have an overhanging on the porch, which eliminates the need for loeuvres and they have doors on both sides. They have been built in blocks of two, three, four or five and moved about - I mean that number can be broken off and moved wherever needed.

As to the estimated life of them, we think that they are comparable to any frame building. What would be the estimated life, thirty-five or forty years? We feel that they would last that length of time. We are using them at the present time virtually at all levels. The overwhelming percentage of them are in the elementary schools. We have a number of them, however, in our junior high schools, and we are trying out two of them this year in one of our senior high schools.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Same identical plant?

DR. LAWSON: Yes. And we find you can do with them what you can do with any class room that we have in existence at the present time.

We haven't tried to use them as chemistry lab rooms or home economics rooms or anything of that type.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Like history, English or general subjects?

DR. LAWSON: Public speaking or anything of that kind they are perfectly all right. We have one hundred five of them in operation at the present time, and we estimate in terms of our projected enrollment and building needs for the future we will need at least sixty-seven more of them in the next five year period. Some of them we already have moved from place to place even within the last two years since we have been using them, and we have had good success in taking them from one place to another.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Relative to that point, apparently you have experienced no difficulty in moving a virtually square class room. You say it is thirty by thirty-two?

DR. LAWSON: Thirty-two point six by thirty actually.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Others have testified that they have constructed their portables roughly twenty-four by forty, or twenty-eight by forty, I believe it is, because of the advantage in moving them, being narrower. You have discovered no difficulty in moving?

DR. LAWSON: No major difficulty. We had to remove the porch from them and take it off in, I think, three sections and put it back on, but it was a minor matter. It caused us no major problem in the transportation of them from one place to another.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: May I ask a question? What distance have you moved those? What is the maximum distance you have moved?

DR. LAWSON: We moved them five or six miles.

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: You moved them five or six miles?

DR. LAWSON: Yes.

MR. KEATING: There was no damage?

DR. LAWSON: That is the maximum. No, there was no damage. There hasn't been.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: What does it cost approximately to move them depending upon the distance?

DR. LAWSON: That has varied. It has run, I would say all told, considering the moving and the placing the concrete piers and the removing the porch, replacing the porch, reinstalling the gas and the electricity, it has run sometimes as high as a thousand dollars. Roughly it's been between let's say seven hundred and nine hundred.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Per class room?

DR. LAWSON: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is less than a dollar a foot.

DR. LAWSON: Yes. Teachers and administrators and pupils using the class rooms have all been very high in their praise of them. As a matter of fact many of our teachers are asking to teach in them because they feel they are insome way superior to the existing rooms that we have. Of course they are newer rooms and newer features, you understand.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: That is one way of keeping the classes down to thirty-five. They are at least assured of that. You can't get more than thirty-five children in them.

DR. LAWSON: They will hold as many. They are normal class room size. In fact, they may be a little bit larger than some of our class rooms.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: If you have got a class room limited to thirty-five, I would be happy, if I were a teacher, too.

DR. LAWSON: Class load is a very important thing. They have cost varying amounts to build. The last batch that we built we had a contract for forty-three of them. They cost, and this is virtually with everything, including one or two minor change orders, sixty-eight sixty-eight was the total amount. It ran about six dollars and eighty-seven cents per square foot. That is the last set that we have built.

Now, we have had previous batches also. I think none of them, none of our sets has run over eight sixty-six per square foot. Of course, they have varied from time to time. This last one was six eighty-seven.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Using the same set of plans each time you have let a contract, do you find there is any appreciable difference in the bid? Any lower bid because the contractor knows what the plans are and has had experience with those plans?

DR. LAWSON: That may have been true. They have cost less each time we have asked for bids on them, and that may be the case, if a contractor has had experience in working with them, the same contractor got the contract on at least two of the occasions.

ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI: You want to point out to the committee you have specified they used redwood.

DR. LAWSON: I wasn't aware I was on such firm ground with the gentleman of the committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Dr. Lawson, what kind of arrangement do you have with the architect on them?

DR. LAWSON: We paid the eight per cent fee for the first one and we

paid one per cent for all those thereafter.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: One per cent? Do you have the same problem in supervision of construction and installation of wiring and all?

DR. LAWSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: One per cent.

MR. KEATING: I might mention, your one per cent covers the clearance through the Division of Architecture and laying it out on the ground?

DR. LAWSON: Right. We have to show a plot plan and proper spacing and all.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: How about mechanical structural and electrical fees? That doesn't come out of the one per cent, does it? Are those separately handled?

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: That is separately handled.

MR. KEATING: Your maintenance people connect up your utilities?

DR. LAWSON: That is correct.

MR. KEATING: But, the builder builds it right up to the end of the building and then your own maintenance crew connect it up?

DR. LAWSON: Yes. That is not a part of the percentage at all.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We have to be careful when we talk about a one per cent for reuse because that is not really comparable to the reuse of the plan.

DR. LAWSON: It is the architect's fee.

MR. KEATING: The one per cent is the architect's fee?

DR. LAWSON: That has nothing to do with the installation.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: It never has anything to do with in-

stallation.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Take on a new plant architect's fee of seven and a quarter, whatever it is, includes everything. That includes his pay out to the structural and mechanical.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: On one they have set up they don't need all that information any more. They have got it, see.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I just want to get that clear for the record because it sounds like a tremendous contrast.

DR. LAWSON: I understand some of you want to see them this afternoon. If you will come to the central administration building, 17th and N at two o'clock. The address is 1619 N Street, but I am asking our assistant superintendent in the elementary division to take you to the schools you want to see. I understood you wanted to see Hollywood Park. We have those schools, and also many of the schools that we ourselves built.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: One other question I don't think we have asked and the statement hasn't been made. What is your average time from the date you let the bid on these portables until you get delivery on them?

DR. LAWSON: Well, we like to figure on at least ninety days on it.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The average is ninety days roughly?

DR. LAWSON: Yes. We could do it in less time than that, but that is what we like to figure.

MR. KEATING: Do you have any double session children in Sacramento?

DR. LAWSON: No, none at all. We have been able to just barely keep ahead of the parade.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Are there any other questions from members of the committee of Dr. Lawson?

ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I would like to make an observation Mr. Chairman, I am very much impressed with the testimony given by Dr. Lawson as to what they are doing in Sacramento.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It is very interesting and incidentally much of what you have said here confirms the experience of the San Diego City School District, where they have had very rapid growth and where, as you are probably well informed, they have worked out a program of combining movable permanents with their purely permanent portion of their new sites, and their teachers there expressed the same thing through one of their principals to me that about fifty per cent of the teachers requested to stay in the movable class rooms even though they had the option of going into the permanent portion of the site. Thanks very much, and then we will see more of it this afternoon.

DR. LAWSON: Fine.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, we will now call Mr. McPherson. Will you state your full name and position for the reporter?

MR. MC PHERSON:I am Harry McPHerson, Superintendent of the Napa City Elementary School District and Napa City Union High School District.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You are superintendent of both of those?

MR. MC PHERSON: Yes, it is a unified administration under two separate boards, but overlapping boards.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is very interesting.

MR. MC PHERSON: It is a little different.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I thought that was a little different.

MR. MC PHERSON: Three of the seven members are on both boards.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Never heard of that before.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is really unusual.

MR. MC PHERSON: The city elementary district comprises about two thirds of the population, and the assessed valuation and children of the high school district, but I think there are ten or eleven total elementary districts, the others being the small, three to seven teachers.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Have you been on State aid?

MR. MC PHERSON:No, we haven't. I am unique, I guess, in coming before this committee, but--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We have actually called a number before us who are not because we get some interesting contrasts.

MR. MC PHERSON:I have some opinions, I guess because I see State aid coming, and I have expressed them to Mr. Geddes and he thought we should be here.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We will be glad to have your recommendations on the record if you have some specific problems to point up and recommendatinns to make.

MR. MC PHERSON: I think my opinion is colored by the fact that I see state aid in the offing. The Napa Valley prediction for growth and growth factor, which is already beginning to hit us, indicates that we may be another Contra Costa County. We have just gone through a building program, a small building program of four elementary schools and a junior high school, which was occupied this fall.

I would like to point out that the local community, not just the superintendent and the board, wants to stay off state aid if we possibly can and that it was our district which initiated the legislation last year, a year ago, which increased the bonding capacity of a union high school district maintaining the junior college to the full ten per cent.

You may recall that bill which went through. Within three or four years in the indicated growth, we will be knocking at the door of the state. The city elementary district has bonded itself to more than capacity. It will be bonded to its limit for the next five or six years as we sell bonds. And it is just about to get off the double shift completely.

But, the subdividers heard about it, I guess, and moved in this fall and we will be back on double shifts apparently by fall again.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You are sure you didn't run a news item in the paper like one we saw from the desert region. Mr. Keating has it on file. What was the name of that little lake out in the desert? They didn't have enough children to fill the kindergarten requirement of twenty-five so they were stating that they hoped some subdivider would take pity on the area and move in and build houses.

MR. MC PHERSON: We have seen the state aid work around in the elementary districts, in the high school districts. It has beena God send to some of the smaller districts, no doubt, but I am particularly concerned about the effect on the secondary program, having operated both junior college and junior high schools and having just completed a junior high school master plan for twelve hundred students. We had just enough money together with our federal aid to build for seven hundred. By the time - it took about a year for the plans - by the time the plans were completed, the

bulding was under way, we knew we would have to put eight hundred in and we have nine hundred in it. It is crowded. It has seventy-five hundred square feet.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Seventy-five hundred?

MR. MC PHERSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is a junior high?

MR. MC PHERSON: That is a junior high school.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Seventh and eighth?

MR. MC PHERSON: Seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth.

MR. KEATING: Seventy-five hundred square feet for the entire plant?

MR. MC PHERSON: It is constructed now, and we are convinced, having operated there, that seven hundred fifty is a maximum that should be in the plant. The expansion of that, whih we will undertake as quickly as new bond issue is voted still will not bring the capacity of the plant beyond one hundred square feet per child we are quite convinced.

Now, I think Mr. Geddes can testify that we went--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Pardon me, did you mean one hundred square feet per child or eighty?

MR. MC PHERSON: I realize eighty is the maximum, and that is the point of my discussion, that I think it is just a completely unrealistic figure for secondary schools if you are to have your gymnasium, if you are to have a cafeteria, which becomes a multi-use room, and I am eliminating from discussion an auditorium, which we think is desirable, but when you have provided the corridor space and the shops and the crafts rooms which need more space, your science, your home making,

that eighty square feet just can't be done.

We are concerned particularly for this reason. Now that we are about to expand this plant and we are planning on starting the plans immediately for two more junior high schools, these plans can be almost completely financed locally at the cost that we have been getting, but in view of probable future state aid we are facing now the problem of trying to fit our planning program into the state form because if we don't we will be confronted later on with a penalty in the future construction.

And it seems vastly unfair and impractical to the board and to the staff that is doing the planning with the specter of future state aid three or four years away, that we have to completely change our plans of what we think is a good secondary school.

MR. KEATING: Well, if you have, Dr. McPherson - your enrollment plan for that school is how much?

MR. MC PHERSON: Seven hundred. We felt,we had anticipated seven hundred to seven hundred fifty being housed in the plant, which we were now able to build. We have nine hundred in it and it is a mess. It is just too many students.

MR. KEATING: You have nine hundred in it now?

MR. MC PHERSON: Yes, and the fact that is has seventy-five hundred square feet would indicate that it does take one hundred square feet per child. Now, with the additional class rooms to bring it up to its capacity of twelve hundred, we still will be at the one hundred square feet per child.

MR. KEATING: Well, were you basic buildings, like your gymnasium,

multipurpose room, cafeteria, which are your big units--

MR. MC PHERSON: You see, we had to drop the idea of the cafeteria, which we would have constructed. Now, with that addition and with the class rooms and the additional shops, we will still keep that ratio.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I want to ask a question on these figures. I think there is some inaccuracy. You keep speaking of seventy-five hundred square feet. That would only be ten square feet per student, if you have got seven hundred fifty children.

MR. MC PHERSON: Seventy-five thousand square feet.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I thought that was what you meant, but the record didn't show it.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: I thought he might bring with him a brochure on the school they have just finished.

MR. MC PHERSON: I thought the committee might like to look those over. (They were handed out.) It was in the nature of a report to the community on the type of building that we constructed.

We built two elementary schools and the junior high school out of a new type of material called stress-crete, which gives us a complete masonry steel frame building. We built it in a factory type finish with no attempt at painting,and plastering we reduced to a minimum.

The conduits and other features were left exposed. And it came in a completely durable and low maintenance building at eleven dollars and ten cents a square foot for the construction under the state aid formula.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Is that pre-stressed concrete, reinforced concrete?

MR. MC PHERSON: Yes. It is a pre-stressed concrete block.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: With steel reinforcing?

MR. MC PHERSON: Yes, manufactured at a plant and brought in and set in place.

MR. KEATING: Mr. McPherson, did the Office of School House Planning help you with the design on this on account of the federal aid on this plant?

MR. MC PHERSON: No, other than doing the usual checking and the usual consulting with them. There was no special assistance.

MR. KEATING: Didn't they have to approve your plans?

MR. MC PHERSON: Oh, yes.

MR. KEATING: And they approved them at one hundred square feet per child?

MR. MC PHERSON: No, apoarently that didn't enter into it. You see, we were on a complete double session. The square footage allowance was based upon the number of children that we had to house, which means that the other school is overcrowded still.

MR. KEATING: I see.

MR. MC PHERSON: Well, this would lead me to my second recommendation that, if it is possible, to change froma square foot allowance that the bill be revised to set a per pupil allotment for school districts leaving the initiative within the district to strive for greater space and facilities rather than for finish in a school building.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You mean a per pupil dollar amount, in other words, so many dollars per pupil rather than so many square feet per pupil?

MR. MC PHERSON: That is right.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: That would be similar to our testimony yesterday. The man from Sacramento could have gotten a multi-purpose room if they were allowed the division of money rather than the square footage. That is a good point to clear up.

MR. MC PHERSON: If you had some such method of allocation we now would not be handicapped in trying to anticipate five years from now state aid, but would be able to continue to build the type of school plant where we want space rather than finish. It seems to me that the emphasis now is upon refinements in a school aided building rather than the area which we really need for the junior high school age in particular.

MR. KEATING: You talk about refinements?

MR. MC PHERSON: Well, yes.

MR. KEATING: Would you explain that further, sir?

MR. MC PHERSON: I think that my emphasis is upon the school building which is rugged with the space available for active youngsters rather than a wood or plaster finish. I would rather not go into details in what I think our finish, which is sometimes unnecessary in school buildings, desirable perhaps, but we would trade them for the space which we think is necessary.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Do you know offhand what the percentage ratio of your covered passageways is to your indoor square footage?

MR. MC PHERSON: Speaking of the junior high school?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Of the Ridgeview high school of which you have given us a picture here.

MR. MC PHERSON: The enclosed area was sixty thousand square

feet out of the seventy-four thousand eight hundred ninety-six. The areas of the corridors was fourteen thousand eight hundred twenty.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Almost twenty-five per cent covered passageway.

MR. KEATING: That is where you are losing square foot area. Do you have to have enclosed corridors?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: If I may make the observation, that has probably tended to make your total per square foot cost of eleven ten look a little lower than it really is in a sense, because you divide the figure of all your covered passageway at one half, so that having a little more than the average percentage of covered passageway tends to broaden your base for figuring your eleven ten per square foot on the overall project.

MR. MC PHERSON: That is possible. I assumed that that method of figuring was correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You figured it according to the standard method all right. You see if you have sixty per cent in covered passageway you ar going to get a much higher per square foot, or somewhat higher per square foot figure on the same total project cost. I think Stockton high school was ten forty-six, wasn't it?

MR. KEATING: The overall figure was nine eighty-six for the entire plant.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: I think his gymnasium ran twelve something.

MR. KEATING: But, the overall square foot area I don't have.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We will check the record on that.

MR. KEATING: It was less than ten dollars for the entire plant.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: This structure here is more durable than the frame structure?

MR. MC PHERSON: It in effect would be close to a reinforced - the same idea in upkeep and so on, and that was our purpose in something that didn't need repair with that age group of twelve to sixteen years of age.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: The roof is of the same material?

MR. MC PHERSON: No. The roof - it is a poured gypsum roof.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: A poured gypsum roof?

MR. MC PHERSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Mr. McPherson, how important to the educational program do you consider the multipurpose rooms? I mean is it in the class of necessity, semi luxury, or luxury?

MR. MC PHERSON: Well, I would say a necessity in an elementary school, and particularly in the junior high school.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: A necessity in both areas?

MR. MC PHERSON: Yes. In the elementary school we built two new seven room schools. That is the kindergarten and six class rooms. We did not add the multipurpose room now partly because of no money and partly the feeling that the kindergarten could act as a half day multi-use room until we built our next section, and our purpose would be to add the multi-use room with the next six class rooms.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: That is the problem a lot of us are facing with the allocation of a multipurpose room in almost a luxury class and in so many of our areas our people have said they feel they are a necessity and they shouldn't be penalized for selecting it as part of the

cultural program. Yesterday afternoon I asked Mr. Jaqueth the possibility of putting that in a lower category of necessity and he said that it was classified in many areas that it wasn't used for actual school purposes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is very true, but I think in the vast majority of approved plans by the Allocation Board for elementary schools do include multipurpose rooms, don't they?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Up in our district they have a question of multipurpose room or class roomand they need desperately both, and they said the multipurpose room was classified as a semi-luxury, and to them it isn't. They haven't any place to meet anywhere.

MR. MC PHERSON: I think most of the trouble comes in those districts where they are trying to keep their number of students per class room below the state figure of thirty-three. For instance sixty-per cent of our elementary classes are between twenty-five and thirty.

MR. KEATING: Oh, they are?

MR. MC PHERSON: And we feel that is about right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is an optimum program, but many many districts just have to go to thirty-three or thirty-five as a standard procedure. Thank you very much, Mr. McPherson. That certainly has added materially to our record.

MR. MC PHERSON: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Is anybody here representing Mr. Oddstad? Dr. Ram, did you have something? I will warn you ahead of time that the committee record does have a substantial amount of testimony from you with respect to narrow passageways and one hundred ten feet versus

eighty feet per student in high schools. If you have something different for additional information, we would be very happy to hear it. We are trying to avoid repetition.

DR. RAM: I am Larry Ram, the Superintendent of the Hayward Union High School District, and I also serve as President of the group of superintendents in the State who are studying the high school problems. Much of the evidence this committee already has and I have just a few comments to make.

The problem that we are facing in the Hayward District is probably similar to a lot of them. We have housing for five thousand students. In the first four grades, which will be the high school students a few years from now, we have fifteen thousand youngsters in our district. There is a difference of ten thousand that we will have to provide housing for starting four years from now, and at the end of those four years, we will have to have five schools of two thousand each, and those arenot small high schools.

The problem there, I think, is one of projection. Three years doesn't give us enough time to build that fast. If we had one school to build or to worry about the three year projection might be enough, but I think we ought to be able to project five years on a district that is growing as rapidly as ours.

The other problem we have which this committee is going to be faced with rapidly, is the difference in the program in the elementary schools and in the high schools. Up to now a five per cent allowance has been made for site development. That doesn't fit the needs of a high school because of the large program we have out of doors, and especially

after school. We recently fixed up the field of one of our own high schools at a cost of about sixty thousand dollars. Now, that didn't include tennis courts. It included no fencing, no sidewalks, no toilets, no storage and no bleachers. It did include leveling and grading to provide for natural drainage. It provided for a streamlining system for a track, a football field.

These other items I listed are desirable, but we didn't have the money to do it. I have here a request from one of the schools for three hundred seventy-four dollars for hurdles to be replaced because the hurdles were left out all year. We had no place to store them and they were damaged or disappeared. That is one of the problems of storage that we have at the high school level. I got that from a school just the other day, and I brought it along to use as an example of one of the problems.

The other problem I want to state briefly is the eighty square feet. We have planned a high school for eighty square feet and the State Department of Education became so alarmed at what eighty square feet does to a school that they have asked to meet with our board to discuss it and we are meeting on the 29th of November with the State Department of Education to discuss the planning that went into this high school which resulted from having to try to plan it within eighty square feet.

Another problem we have is central administration. We are going to have to move out of a building because it is coming down. There is no place for us to go, our central staff. We are planning an administration unit of about ten thousand square feet and the only walls we are putting

in that unit are the walls where people will have to have confidential conversations occasionally. That will be the guidance person, maybe a superintendent, the assistant superintendent. The rest of the area we plan to use just bare and put up our own partitions with our own crew.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is the way a lot of business organizations do as a matter of choice where money isn't even a factor.

DR. RAM: But the space is what bothers us, to put up space for ten thousand square feet, and that is cutting the thing rather close. It is going to take it away from students and we already are limited on that. Now, that briefly covers what hasn't been covered here today. I had some other things, but Mr. Dent covered them pretty well.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You mentioned the problem of storage, Dr. Ram, particularly citing the example of the track hurdles. What kind of a building do you need for much of that routine storage?

DR. RAM: We don't need much if they just wouldn't charge it against us.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It is my understanding from what Mr. Finch of the Division of Architecture said yesterday and Mr. Keating, barracks type or quonset type building are not charged against the district. Would that be true of a storage area?

MR. KEATING: I think Mr. Jaqueth - if he is not here, I will try to explain . Isn't there some square foot area that is constructed for other than class rooms that is not charged against you now, Dr. Ram?

DR. RAM: If it was constructed before 1947 and was constructed for that purpose and is inadequate.

MR. KEATING: But any class rooms that you have now that you

wanted to convert into storage area, you could get relief on that for storage area?

DR. RAM: We couldn't afford to convert class rooms.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: My thought was that routine gymnasium equipment or track equipment, lawn mowers, that a good grade quonset set out on the field in a corner some place might be thoroughly adequate to lock it up and keep it from being damaged by the weather or pilfered. Would that be adequate?

DR. RAM: We would be very happy to have that.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The district would be unable to afford that?

DR. RAM: The minute we start constructing it they charge us with a square footage.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I don't think that would be charged against you.

DR. RAM: We were going to build a greenhouse - that is just a slab with a glass over it and they were going to charge us with a square footage.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: There is something wrong with that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: One place they were charging a quonset house against a school which was constructed for buses.

DR. RAM: That is the only way we would construct them.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: What do you do, leave the bus out of doors?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is certainly something we better check into. If they can't build a quonset for equipment and not have it charged against their square footage.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Obviously if you leave the bus out in the elements, in a period of time you could buy a quonset hut for the damage done. They were allocating the space against their flooring.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: There is something unreasonable about that.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: May I ask a question. With reference to putting a building up for some of this equipment, don't you think it is about as cheap to buy the equipment as it is to build a building to store it? It isn't very expensive - it could be painted.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: There is much more equipment to store than hurdles.

DR. RAM: This just came in across my desk so I brought it up here.

MR. KEATING: I would like to mention this, I think from the Allocation Board's thinking on certain districts and there has been quite a few districts applied for state aid that have used their own bond money to build storage areas, bus garages, expensive utilities other than class rooms, and that is one of the reasons that the regulation was put through that any facilities that were constructed prior to 1947, when the state aided program came in, for a specific purpose would not be counted as the overall square foot area of the district.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That was it.

MR. KEATING: That only has another year to go and it is subject to change. The original intent of the state aided program was to build class rooms and class rooms only to take care of the needs of the district. All these other, if I recall the law, all these other desirable features of

of school facilities was subordinated until the class room needs were met.

DR. RAM: May I take one more approach to this. I have met with superintendents statewide, maybe ten or twelve times during the last year, studying these problems. And we feel like, well if you use this example, if a person was told he could not weigh more than one hundred twenty pounds, would he rather shrink to one hundred twenty or would he rather have an arm cut off or a leg cut off or something like that.

You get in the same problem with this high school situation. You have a total program. If you are going to have to house that program, are you going to shrink the total school down and have everything smaller or are you going to lop things off. That is the problem we are faced with, and that is the apprpach that our committee took.

We first tried to determine what is a high school program. And after we determined what it was, then we decided what space did we have to have to house it, that is just the necessary space to put the furniture and the youngsters in. And that is what I have here as a result of the study. Instead of trying to tell you about it, I would like to give each one of you a copy and you can look at it.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We would appreciate that. Please understand some of our critical questioning isn't by way of criticism at all, but simply in an effort to get an objective analysis of the facts. I think personally I might make the observation that I am sure you do have a very serious problem, and I know, working with administrators statewide, you are giving consideration to adjustment of what may have been a hastily conceived square foot figure for the secondary school at a time when the secondary school wasn't even in the state aid program. We

are going to give that thorough consideration and we have, be assured, no preconceived notions of limiting it.

DR. RAM: We are all in the same fix you people are. We will be paying for these schools ourselves long after we are through teaching, too. And we are trying to give you the information that will help you make the decision.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Mr. Chairman, can we point out that issue, too, of the quonset hut or the temporary, so-called temporary, type of building, not being allocated to the square footage for such uses as garage and needed maintenance?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is right. I think that is something that we are going to have to work out because it seems manifestly unjust that they can't with their own local money build a quonset hut to store track equipment without having it charged against their footage space.

DR. RAM: The other was the central facilities, like a warehouse. The only way the purchasing agent can save us money is by buying in large quantities in advance.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: And you have no place to put it.

DR. RAM: That is right.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: If we can amend that law next March--

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We are getting into a whole area of the problem in the secondary that hasn't been approached before.

DR. RAM: The central administration, I think, can be worked out pretty much as I told you, if they are allowed walls for the offices where

confidential conversations take place and the rest is open because we have found that eight per cent of a building goes into wall space and it is not only a lot of space, but it is also a lot of money.

MR. KEATING: Dr. Ram, can I ask one question, sir. I think I know, but I want to get the answer from you. In your recently constructed projects for a complete school plant in the loading of that school plant with pupils according to the formula of the Department of Educatinn Board, have you utilized all the square foot area allowed for that plant, or have you saved some square foot area for other purposes such as you find need for now?

DR. RAM: No, sir, it is all in there.

MR. KEATING: You used it all up?

DR. RAM: That is right.

MR. KEATING: Has the architect ever tried to save any part of it for central administration?

DR. RAM: No, sir. We even have struggles between departments - you take ten square feet out of the wood shop and give it to the home making room and so forth, and it is a real problem.

MR. KEATING: Some districts, I have noticed, in the applications that come through, have not used the full square foot area allowed for the staffing of their pupils.

DR. RAM: Not at the high school level, though, I don't think, Mr. Keating.

MR. KEATING: I am thinking about the elementary at the moment. I didn't know you had a construction of a high school?

DR. RAM: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That raises another question, Dr. Ram. Have you from one - let me go back one step. Are you concerned with high school only?

DR. RAM: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You have no elementary school under your jurisdiction?

DR. RAM: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You haven't reached the point yet where you could effect a reuse of plans, but I gather from what you have said, expecting ten thousand student growth in the next six or eight years in the secondary level, that you will be constructing as many as five high school plants. Once you get a basic plan, it would seem there might be real hope that you could reuse basically the same plant from one site to another and save considerable in the time it would take to complete construction and in the bidding on the project and in the architect's fee. That is something to keep in mind. You haven't yet reached a satisfactory base plan, I realize that.

DR. RAM: That is right. Any other question?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: If there is no further questions from the committee, we appreciate your coming over, Dr. Ram, and we appreciate the copies you have there. Apparently Mr. Oddstad, who phoned yesterday and said he would be here at eleven o'clock has not arrived from Redwood City. The purpose of his visit was to discuss with the committee in some greater detail the so-called Oddstad plan of emergency housing for elementary school students. I will just say for the record, because we will be receiving some information from the superintendent of that district,

the Laguna Salada Elementary School District over in the vicinity of Redwood City, faced a problem of tremendous growth of the huge subdivision of Linda Mar area, which was under construction in an area where there was no elementary school. They faced a problem of putting out some sixty thousand dollars for buses to take these students to the nearest school, which itself then would be tremendously overcrowded.

They effected a very temporary solution on a lease rental basis wherein they incorporated about eleven or twelve of the houses in the tract with a common passageway into a small elementary school, leaving out all the interior walls and making the class room one class room per house, about twenty-four by forty. They did not put the garages on the houses. Later on after they had had a chance to build an elementary school they took down the common passageway, breezeway they called it, and built the garages and sold the houses and it apparently proved satisfactory to everybody as a very interim emergency type situation.

It figured out to cost about ten cents per student, per day, according to the information which we have received. Mr. H. C. Erickson, the superintendent of that Laguna Salada District is going to submit to the committee for the record his detailed study of how it worked out from the administrative point of view. We do have and will incorporate in the record a brochure called the Oddstad School Plan, inasmuch as Mr. Andres F. Oddstad, Jr., the principal builder in the Linda Mar Area and his architects developed this plan that facilitated the schooling of the kids - also facilitated the sale of homes in the area where people were loath to buy where no school facilities were available.

It is unfortunate the principal architect of this program, Mr. Oddstad

has not arrived. Sam, do you have any thoughts on that situation since you suggested we hear from him?

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: The only thing I had in reference to that - this plan is being utilized in other subdivisions.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON:It is now being used in other areas so it was used more than once?

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: The people there in that district had turned down a bond issue and they had a very critical problem to house these children and from all the information I can gather it worked out very satisfactorily and is being used in two other subdivisions, I know, right now.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It would then appear it might hold some hope for other rapidly growing areas where a tract of three or four hundred or a thousand homes are going up overnight and the school capacity just isn't available. Beyond that, I think, of course, it would not be satisfactory.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: This suggests now it is going to be some method or hope to bring about when a large subdivision goes in a certain amount of land is set aside for a school district. In other words,the created demand by the new homes should take care of the demand for schools in some respects.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: In this way the youngsters moving into the new tract could be educated while the school plant is being constructed on the site all about the same time,concurrent operation.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: Yes and maybe the cost factor would be a little less, too. They have their organization to build at the time they

are building their homes to build the school.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Well, I think we ought to stick around for a few minutes in case Mr. Oddstad should arrive late. I would hate to have him spend two hours driving over from Redwood City and find he had missed us by five minutes. (After a few minutes Mr. Oddstad arrived.) Mr. Oddstad, if you will just take a chair and make yourself comfortable - we have given something of an introduction for the record of what you did, but if you would start out and give us just a little of the background in your own words additional to what you have printed, we would appreciate it. It is certainly very interesting.

MR. ODDSTAD: All right, sir. Mr. Chairman, we, as you know, are builders in the San Francisco Area, and we have been working in San Mateo County principally. We are like all builders, when we come into a community, we aggravate their already pretty tough conditions in the way of overcrowding the existing community facilities, and I guess the most critical need has been that in schools.

Well, out here at Laguna Salada, I don't know if you are familiar with the Bay Area, but the coast side of San Francisco experienced its first real boom in 1906 when the ocean shore was subdivided and all those ots and properties were sold off all through the country, but there was no building there of any consequence. So to date when we came in there, there was about fifteen hundred houses in an area that could ultimately house some nine thousand to ten thousand houses.

So the Laguna Salada School District was put into quite a crimp because we came in there and in one year we would need facilities that were twice to three times what they could provide in the community

because its tax base was such it would be impossible for it to finance its own schools until such a time as the valuation, assessed valuation became greater.

Well, Mr. Erickson, who is the superintendent of the Laguna Salada School District and I worked on the problem of locating sites that would meet with both the school board's and the State Division of Architecture's approval in their control of school sites, and then we had the problem of how we could possibly get a school up there in time to keep them from going on quadruple session. They were already on double session.

So we examined practically every way that was possible to develop a facility that would be acceptable. They were quite familiar with rental facilities since they at the present time were renting the basement of a church and I think they have an old post office they rent, so they knew something about rental. So we discussed it from the standpoint of renting buildings, some areas in the shopping center itself and then renting them out as class rooms, but we came to the problem of trying to finance it.

So that put quite a crimp in our plans. We were quite well along on our shopping center deal when our bank, like all banks, they said,"Well, this is not the primary purpose for which this is intended and we are not going to be able to lend you any money on it."

So we conceived the idea after two or three discussions I had. I happened to be the regional vice president of the National Association of Home Builders and we discussed this problem back in Washington, D. C., with our executive committee and Mr. Nathan Loehause, the first vice president of the association had the same problem in Chicago.

Another builder had the same problem down in the midwest, and we came up with the idea of trying to use houses and hooking them together. I told them I would go ahead and see whether we could put together such a project, which we did in cooperation with the Laguna Salada Board .

What we did in order to minimize their cost of school sites, we made an interior site so that there was actually a row of lots around the entire site, as you can see from the description here - the school, the street work, and then you have a row of lots which are one hundred feet deep and then you have the interior school site in there which makes the development of the school site considerably cheaper, and this way we were able to sell of our sites for the cost of the bare land since the improvements were paid by the people whose homes fronted on it.

So having this advantageous condition already, we just set aside ten lots or eleven lots actually and built houses on there without any interior partitions and connected them with an exterior covered walk, put in some toilet facilities which later will be given to the school for their recreational facilities, and we ended up with what was quite an acceptable temporary structure for it, so that the school could actually get started in it. So that was the gist of what we had done there.

We have been working with the school board. I might go into the financing of it a little bit. Actually these house where they are not finished are not eligible, of course, for a full construction loan of a residential nature. So we appealed to the San Francisco bank through their president of the community need that existed and asked him if we presented him with estimates on the facility,what we would have there, and how much it would take to put it back into an acceptable home for sale,

whether he would make a construction loan to us based on the house when it was ready for sale to the public, and then we would take that loan out in that amount and then we would take enough funds out of that loan in escrow so that when the school board turned the house back to us we would be able to finish the house off and put it on the market, which he did.

I think they are a fine institutiion and they recognize that they have a duty to the community and they came right along and made the loan.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Which bank was that?

MR. ODDSTAD: The San Francisco Bank. It's now been changed to the First Western Bank.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It is this new trans-American sell off deal to Western Pacific something or other?

MR. ODDSTAD: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It is a new chain.

MR. ODDSTAD: That is the bank and this was while it was the old San Francisco Bank. I don't think that any of their policies have changed materially, but they will have more resources to do a job. I just site them. I think any bank would have done it, but we have had considerable experience with them, so anyway we started this school and in order to get it ready for the fall class we put on quite a burst of speed and I think it took us six weeks from the time we poured the foundations until the children were able to go to school there, so it made--Mr. Erickson was convinced we weren't going to make it and he was discussing having to move his date of starting school up a couple of weeks to make allowance for us, but we made it for him and he was quite happy, and the principal

of the school, I talked with him yesterday, prior to coming up here, to ask him whether in his opinion whether the facilities actually could be utilized for school, and he had no major complaint. He said that the lack of intercommunication system was practically the toughest one because it meant the secretary when she wanted to go down to the kindergarten had a good hike. So he has been quite happy with the facilities and being right adjacent to the school yard, there is plenty of play space for the children. The site right next to them will be the permanent baseball field, so they are taking steps to develop that at this time.

Now, as for the future plans for the school - in discussing them with Mr. Erickson, he states that as it appears now the permanent school which they had requested state aid for back in January of this year, they are just about ready to let it out for bid. They expect to have it in operation next fall. So in the meantime, he would like us to put three additional units on this and build him another ten or twelve units in another location in Linda Mar. So we have told him that we will, and he was and will cooperate with us, and we have tried to recommend this plan to the builders.

It isn't a solution for schools. I mean certainly not, but it does fill an interim proposition where actually as I have told the school board there, we have created the problem, and it would be something that we should stay in and help them solve, and if we didn't we would be sort of derelict in our duty in coming in there. You don't walk away and dump an extra two thousand families on a small community of that nature and then not help them.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You are certainly to be commended for

recognizing that civic responsibility, which I think a good many builders throughout the state have not recognized.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: In this connection does our jurisdiction go so far as to make recommendations as to what changes could be made in the real estate code. It seems to me the builders ought not be permitted to build a residential area without the consideration of the schools.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: They have been doing it all over the country, it is true.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: This is something we should take notice of.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We can certainly take note of this and I think it would be logical in our report to point out what has been done and use this as an example in an area where they have had a real emergency because of several thousand homes going in at one time,or even several hundred homes for that matter, in a small school district. May I ask,Mr. Oddstad, are these first eleven units still being used as school class rooms?

MR. ODDSTAD: Oh, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: They have not been reconverted as your drawing shows plans for?

MR. ODDSTAD: No, I don't imagine, Mr. Chairman, we will get the units back for about five years. There is that much of a growth in there.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That would seem to raise some real problems then on the amount of wear and tear that these future homes may

suffer in that five or six year period, or four or five year period. Will you have to replaster or do they have plastered interior walls? Of course, you haven't got most of your interior walls. You have just the outside.

MR. ODDSTAD: Well, I tell you, Mr. Chairman, what we did. The outside is a complete stucco job which is easy to handle. The roofs are made out of cedar shingles and theexterior, generally speaking, is very rugged and it would take quite a beating. You can't expect them to take it easy. The interior, the floor is wood. It is covered with what we call - well, it is a type of lineolum.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That would protect the hard wood?

MR. ODDSTAD: We just put plywood down and covered it with this and figured when we take it back over we will put the hardwood floors in.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: So you have your subflooring plywood and this linoleum?

MR. ODDSTAD: So we have a good flooring and it will wear for the time it will be used as schools. The walls themselves are sheet rock, but what we did was wainscot them with a four foot high plywood to take the scuffing. And so I don't think the buildings will suffer much. And the rental on this unit, which is set up to amortize the cost, the cost of the additional paving we had to do and some of the work we had to do, which we normally would tear out, after the school board applied to the county clerk for takingit off the tax rolls, it amounts to eighty dollars a month per unit. So that actually will amortize it and will take care of it. I have told the school board that we haven't wanted to make

money on it. All we want to do is cover the costs of doing it.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Of course, the money that is tied up in your investment for that period of time is a problem?

MR. ODDSTAD: It ties up the builder's working capital. To cover that point I wanted to go a little further into that, which makes this even a more advantageous solution for this temporary problem - the national chairman of the Association of Home Builders in discussing this with him, we were able to get a resolution out of our legislative committee requesting that in the Divisionof Housing Act that they make a provision that the FHA be allowed to insure structures of this nature that would be used for community facilities during the entire time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is a national enactment.

MR. ODDSTAD: And under the FHA code these are now eligible for insurance, which will allow a builder to get closer to his actual costs. We have quite a bit of money tied up in them. Under the new financing we should have a minimum amount of money per unit tied up.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: This eighty dollars a month average cost per unit, will that include the cost of and the removal of the fencing which appears in the drawing to be around each class room area?

MR. ODDSTAD: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: As well as the breezeway and all of that extra paving too?

MR. ODDSTAD: Yes. It will, and we expect it to amortize those toilets so we can cut them out.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That raises the point. Where are the toilet facilities?

MR. ODDSTAD: It is a separate little building and it is so arranged, as you can see, that we can cut it out of the lots on both sides so that we can give it to them for the recreational building.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: There are no toilets installed in any of the individual houses then?

MR. ODDSTAD: Just in the two kindergarten rooms. We put the toilets in there. I will take that back. The first grade and the two kindergarten we put toilets in there for the children.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as several observations have been made, we would have lots less problems if we had more people like Mr. Oddstad floating around.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It would help. And I think the coordinated planning which made it possible to have a future school yard immediately behind a row of the homes - that isn't often the case either. It takes coordinated planning.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: The realization of his responsibility to a community from which he will be living and drawing his livelihood and his family will be living is all too seldom advertised. You always hear about the grafters and chiselers.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I appreciate that comment.

MR. ODDSTAD: The building industry is coming of age and we are trying through our association and the work we are able to do with the builders in the area,we are trying to make them aware of their civic responsibilities, the responsibilities to the community, and it is a big problem. There are things to be said on all sides of it and the problem has been pretty overwhelming. Many times they just haven't had the tools

to do it.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It is a problem of working out this financing arrangement. That must be your major hurdle. That brings me to the point of asking you what your one, two or three major hurdles were to effect this plan once you conceived it so that we may be able to help other areas, say in southern California ,that are going to meet -- I know an area in Orange County that is facing a square mile of houses going up. Originally the elementary school there had about fifty or seventy-five students in it, so they may well have need for this identical program. And there are other areas, too, no doubt. I am wondering what the major hurdles are that they will have to overcome, what the biggest difficulties are so that we may help them over that by some recommendations or suggestions.

MR. ODDSTAD: Well, I think the principal hurdle , as you brought out, was the location. It has to be properly located because a single city lot isn't big enough to handle kids in their playing. You have to be close to the location. It has to be against some type of openness there. The next problem is the problem of working out the mechanics with the particular school board, and their legal counsel. In this case it was the District Attorney of San Mateo County, and also the county superintendent of school's office. That needs very close cooperation.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You have to have coordinated planning from the very outset. If you don't, one agency gets ahead of the other and you are really lost for getting the school at the right location with your homes .

MR. ODDSTAD: That is correct. The location is the most important

I would say. That is the principal hurdle. The second is working with the school, and then I think that we have offered and will send to any builder or any community that wants it a complete set of working drawings of what we have done and also enough cost information that will give them a chance to compare at least in their area.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Would it be too much to ask that the committee be furnished with that set so it might be reproduced in our report which will have some distribution? I don't want to infringe upon any pride of authorship.

MR. ODDSTAD: No.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: This is something that could happen only in America, if you ever want to question the American way of life.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is very true. One question. Did the school have the money available at the time you were laying out your development plans with the County Planning Commission to buy the site, or did you within a large area which you were subdividing temporarily draw off this future schoolsite which they then later acquired with their funds.

MR. ODDSTAD: Well, that is what we did. We gave them an option on the piece of ground.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: It came out of your plot to start with?

MR. ODDSTAD: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: That is the key factor, I think.

MR. ODDSTAD: We negotiated an option price, a price which - we are trying to, as I said, educate the builders to the fact they have these responsibilities. Actually the failure to install community facilities is the

thing that is going to kill growth in California.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: People won't buy homes if they can't get school facilities. As you say, it stimulated the sale of other homes.

MR. ODDSTAD: We advertised no double sessions in Linda Mar.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: The builder benefits and the kids benefit.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: There is enough for everybody if you just find the solution.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Are there other questions members of the committee might wish to pose to Mr. Oddstad? If you have time this afternoon we would certainly like to extend to you the invitation to join use on a tour of some of the portable units in the Sacramento District. I imagine you may have your time pretty well occupied, but we would be glad to have you with us if you do have the time.

MR. ODDSTAD: I certainly appreciate the invitation, but I do have engagements in San Francisco I have to get back to.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: We are deeply indebted to you for taking the time and trouble to come over from Redwood City on your own time and expense to brief the committee. It's been much more enlightening and helpful than just the brochure which we had and the map. We were going to report that, but you have given us the answers to a number of questions which I am sure other communities would raise and we wouldn't have the answers.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: And his offer of sending the plans.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Yes, that would be very helpful for us to have to include in our report, and I feel certain other areas in the state will want to give thorough consideration to it.

MR. ODDSTAD: I would certainly be very happy to send that to you.

ASSEMBLYMAN KILPATRICK: Have we learned the cost per square foot to house these children - what is the overall financial picture to the school district per child over this period?

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I don't know whether Mr. Oddstad can answer that. Mr. Erickson is going to submit to us a detailed accounting of how the district met the problem and how it affected them and I assume he will include that type of information. You may be able to answer part of that.

MR. ODDSTAD: From the school board side of it - I couldn't answer it, although they tell me that it is well within their operating budget at this time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Actually per square foot cost to the school district is not a consideration in this. It is an operational cost to get the kids educated and apparently it's worked out very beneficially to all concerned, which is rather remarkable. I mean, I assume you have worked it out with your lending institutions so you are not going to lose on it?

MR. ODDSTAD: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Stimulated the sale of other houses that you couldn't have sold, given the children an education on full session and the district has been able to finance it out of its own tax base, which seems just about ideal.

MR. ODDSTAD: It saved them from having to buy several buses to transport the children.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Your brochure said sixty thousand dollars

worth of buses.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: And upkeep and drivers and maintenance of buses is terrific.

MR. ODDSTAD: The one point that we were talking about that was difficult - I would say that coordinated planning and the development of the ability of the school board to accept this plan and to accept the rather stereotyped type of school room - I mean some of them have some funny ideas about what it takes to educate children, but on most of them the school boards now are very enlightened and that is a problem. The third problem is that of financing as you brought out. Now, the FHA offers in San Francisco within the next week or so - it will have all the particulars on how to finance this through the FHA.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: Would you be able to favor us with a copy of that, too, when it is put out?

MR. ODDSTAD: Yes. We are going to build at least one more school in Linda Mar and possibly two more, and we are currently working in San Bruno, which is adjacent to this area, and they have also asked us to submit a school proposition to them, which we have done. We just finished negotiating last Wednesday night for a site for their new school in the middle of the subdivision, and then we are temporarily going to put in the ten class rooms and administration building for them on the same plan we have here.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: Wherever you have school boards primarily concerned with the education of children, you will find them acceptable. That is where you have to place your value on whether you want your child educated or whether you want to wait until you get some

fancy place.

MR. ODDSTAD: The school board have certainly done an excellent job there. I know in Redwood City and Belmont they have had a tough job.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONAHOE: When you consider they give their services free, it is pretty wonderful dedication, I think.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: I believe that probably covers it pretty well, and we are through right on time.

MR. ODDSTAD: I am going to apologize to the committee again if I may for being so late.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You don't need to apologize again.

ASSEMBLYMAN GEDDES: And we want to thank you for coming up.

MR. ODDSTAD: I certainly appreciate the opportunity.

ASSEMBLYMAN LYON: You have given a real contribution to the committee's investigation. The hearings are adjourned.

(Thereupon the hearing was adjourned.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

---o0o---

This is to certify that I, Alice Book, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, was present at the time and place the foregoing proceedings were had and taken before the Assembly Interim Committee on Education Subcommittee on Public School Construction Costs of the California State Legislature, in the Capitol Building, Sacramento, California on November 18 and 19, 1954, and that as such reporter I did take down said proceedings in shorthand writing, and that thereafter I caused the shorthand writing to be transcribed into longhand typewriting, and that the foregoing pages beginning at the top of page 1 to and including line 15 on page 207 hereof, constitute a true, complete, accurate and correct transcription of the aforementioned shorthand writing.

Dated this 30th day of November, 1954.

Alice Book

Certified Shorthand Reporter